arXiv:hep-th/9812160v2 9 Feb 1999

BPS BLACK HOLES IN SUPERGRAVITY

Duality Groups, p–Branes, Central Charges and the Entropy

by

RICCARDO D'AURIA and PIETRO FRE'

February 1, 2008

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION TO THESE LECTURES **5**

1.1 Extremal Black Holes from Classical General Relativity to String Theory 5

1.2 Extremal Black–Holes as quantum BPS states 8

1.2.1 General definition of BPS states in a 4D theory with $N = 2 \times p$ supersymmetries 9

1.3 The Horizon Area and Central Charges 11

2 SUPERGRAVITY p–BRANES IN HIGHER DIMENSIONS **13**

2.1 Definition and general features of dilatonic p–brane solutions in dimension D . . 13

2.1.1 The elementary string solution of heterotic supergravity in $D = 10$ 15

2.2 $M2$–branes in $D = 11$ and the issue of the horizon geometry 16

2.2.1 Derivation of the G/H M2-brane solution 19

2.2.2 Construction of the BPS Killing spinors in the case of $D = 11$ supergravity 20

2.2.3 M-brane solution 22

3 THE SYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE OF 4D SUPERGRAVITY AND N=2 BPS BLACK HOLES **25**

3.1 Introduction to tetradimensional BPS black–holes and the general form of the supergravity action 25

3.2 Duality Rotations and Symplectic Covariance 29

3.3 Symplectic embeddings of homogenous spaces 35

3.3.1 Symplectic embedding of the $\mathcal{ST}[m, n]$ homogeneous manifolds 38

3.4 Special Kähler Geometry 41

3.4.1 Hodge–Kähler manifolds 42

3.4.2 Special Kähler Manifolds: general discussion 43

3.4.3 Special Kähler manifolds: the local case 45

3.4.4 Special Kähler manifolds: the issue of special coordinates 49

3.4.5 The special geometry of the $\mathcal{ST}[2, n]$ manifolds 50

3.5 The bosonic lagrangian and the supersymmetry transformation rules of N=2 supergravity 53

3.6 $N = 2$ BPS black holes: general discussion 54

3.6.1 Fixed scalars and the entropy 57

4 The Structure of Supergravity Central Charges and the Black Hole Entropy 59
4.1 Introduction . . . 59
4.2 Central Charges in N–extended $D = 4$ supergravity . . . 60
4.2.1 Differential relations obeyed by the dressed charges . . . 63
4.2.2 Sum rules satisfied by central charges . . . 64
4.3 The geodesic potential . . . 65
4.4 General properties of central charges at the extremum . . . 67
4.5 The horizon area as a topological U duality invariant . . . 69
4.5.1 Construction of the quartic $E_{7(7)}$ invariant in the $N = 8$ theory . . . 71

5 N=8 supergravity: BPS black holes with 1/2, 1/4 and 1/8 of supersymmetry 75
5.1 Introduction to $N = 8$ BPS Black Holes . . . 75
5.2 Solvable Lie algebra description of the supergravity scalar manifold . . . 76
5.2.1 Solvable Lie algebras: the machinery . . . 77
5.2.2 Solvable Lie algebras: the simplest example . . . 78
5.2.3 Another example: the solvable Lie algebra of the STU model . . . 79
5.2.4 A third example: solvable Lie algebra description of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$ 79
5.2.5 Solvable Lie algebras: R-R and NS-NS scalars in maximally extended supergravities . . . 84
5.3 Summary of $N = 8$ supergravity. . . . 85
5.4 The Killing spinor equation and its covariance group . . . 87
5.5 Detailed study of the 1/2 case . . . 97
5.5.1 Explicit computation of the Killing equations and of the reduced Lagrangian in the 1/2 case . . . 100
5.5.2 The 1/2 solution . . . 102
5.6 Detailed study of the 1/4 case . . . 103
5.6.1 Killing spinor equations in the 1/4 case: surviving fields and charges. . . . 103
5.6.2 Derivation of the 1/4 reduced lagrangian in Young basis . . . 106
5.6.3 Solution of the reduced field equations . . . 110
5.6.4 Comparison with the Killing spinor equations . . . 111
5.7 Detailed study of the 1/8 case . . . 112
5.7.1 The STU model in the $SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$ theory and solvable Lie algebras . . . 113
5.7.2 First order differential equations: the algebraic approach . . . 114
5.7.3 The first order equations: the special geometry approach . . . 116
5.7.4 The solution: preliminaries and comments on the most general one . . . 118
5.7.5 The solution: a simplified case, namely $S = T = U$ . . . 120

A The full set of first and second order differential equations for the STU–model125

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THESE LECTURES

1.1 Extremal Black Holes from Classical General Relativity to String Theory

Black hole physics has many aspects of great interest to physicists with very different cultural backgrounds. These range from astrophysics to classical general relativity, to quantum field theory in curved space–times, particle physics and finally string theory and supergravity. This is not surprising since black–holes are one of the basic consequences of a fundamental theory, namely Einstein general relativity. Furthermore black–holes have fascinating thermodynamical properties that seem to encode the deepest properties of the so far unestablished fundamental theory of quantum gravity. Central in this context is the Bekenstein Hawking entropy:

$$S_{BH} = \frac{k_B}{G\hbar}\,\frac{1}{4}\,\mathrm{Area}_H \tag{1.1.1}$$

where k_B is the Boltzman constant, G is Newton's constant, $\hbar$ is Planck's constant and Area_H denotes the area of the horizon surface.

This very precise relation between a thermodynamical quantity and a geometrical quantity such as the horizon area has been for more than twenty years the source of unextinguishable interest and meditation. Indeed a microscopic statistical explanation of the area law for the black hole entropy has been correctly regarded as possible only within a solid formulation of quantum gravity. Superstring theory is the most serious candidate for a theory of quantum gravity and as such should eventually provide such a microscopic explanation of the area law. Although superstrings have been around for more than twenty years a significant progress in this direction came only recently [1], after the so called second string revolution (1995). Indeed black holes are a typical non–perturbative phenomenon and perturbative string theory could say very little about their entropy: only non perturbative string theory can have a handle on it and our handle on non perturbative string theory came after 1995 through the recognition of the role of string dualities. These dualities allow to relate the strong coupling regime of one superstring model to the weak coupling regime of another one and are all encoded in the symmetry group (the U–duality group) of the low energy *supergravity effective action*. Paradoxically this low energy action is precisely the handle on the non perturbative aspects of superstrings.

Since these lectures are addressed to an audience assumed to be mostly unfamiliar with superstrings, supergravity and superstrings we have briefly summarized this recent conceptual revolution in order to put what follows in the right perspective. What we want to emphasize is that the first instance of a microscopic explanation of the area law within string theory has been limited to what in the language of general relativity would be an *extremal black hole*. This is not a capricious choice but has a deep reason. Indeed the extremality condition, namely the coincidence of two horizons, obtains, in the context of a supersymmetric theory, a profound reinterpretation that makes extremal black holes the most interesting objects to study. To introduce the concept consider the usual Reissner Nordstrom metric describing a black–hole of mass m and electric (or magnetic) charge q:

$$ds^2 \,=\, -dt^2\,\left(1-\frac{2m}{\rho}+\frac{q}{\rho^2}\right)+d\rho^2\,\left(1-\frac{2m}{\rho}+\frac{q}{\rho^2}\right)^{-1}+\rho^2\,d\Omega^2 \tag{1.1.2}$$

where $d\Omega^2 = (d\theta^2+\sin^2\theta\,d\phi^2)$ is the metric on a 2–sphere. As it is well known the metric (1.1.2) admits two killing horizons where the norm of the killing vector $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ changes sign. The horizons are at the two roots of the quadratic form $\Delta \equiv -2m\rho+q^2+\rho^2$ namely at:

$$\rho_\pm = m\pm\sqrt{m^2-q^2} \tag{1.1.3}$$

If $m<|q|$ the two horizons disappear and we have a naked singularity. For this reason in the context of classical general relativity the *cosmic censorship* conjecture was advanced that singularities should always be hidden inside horizon and this conjecture was formulated as the bound:

$$m \,\geq\, |q| \tag{1.1.4}$$

As we shall see, in the context of a supersymmetric theory the bound (1.1.4) is always guaranteed by supersymmetry. As anticipated, of particular interest are the states that saturate the bound (1.1.4). If $m=|q|$ the two horizons coincide and the metric (1.1.2) can be rewritten in a new interesting way. Setting:

$$m=|q| \quad ; \quad \rho = r+m \quad ; \quad r^2=\vec{x}\cdot\vec{x} \tag{1.1.5}$$

eq.(1.1.2) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -dt^2\,\left(1+\frac{q}{r}\right)^{-2}+\left(1+\frac{q}{r}\right)^2\,\left(dr^2+r^2\,d\Omega^2\right) \\ &= -H^{-2}(\vec{x})\,dt^2+H^2(\vec{x})\,d\vec{x}\,\cdot\,d\vec{x} \end{aligned} \tag{1.1.6}$$

where by:

$$H(\vec{x}) = \left(1+\frac{q}{\sqrt{\vec{x}\,\cdot\,\vec{x}}}\right) \tag{1.1.7}$$

we have denoted a harmonic function in a three–dimensional space spanned by the three cartesian coordinates $\vec{x}$ with the boundary condition that $H(\vec{x})$ goes to 1 at infinity.

The metric (1.1.6) already contains all the features of the black hole metrics we shall consider in these lectures:

1. It is of the form:
$$ds^2 = -e^{2U(r)}\, dt^2 + e^{-2U(r)}\, d\vec{x}^2 \tag{1.1.8}$$
where the radial function $U(r)$ is expressed as a linear combination of harmonic functions of the *transverse coordinates* $\vec{x}$:
$$U(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \alpha_i \log H_i(\vec{x}) \tag{1.1.9}$$

2. It is asymptotically flat $\Longrightarrow U(\infty) = 0$

3. It is a Maxwell Einstein metric in the sense that it satisfies Einstein equations with the stress–energy tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ contributed by a suitable collection of abelian gauge fields A_μ^Λ $(\Lambda = 1, \ldots, \overline{n})$.

4. It saturates the cosmic censorship bound (1.1.4) in the sense that its ADM mass is expressed as an algebraic function of the electric and magnetic charges hidden in the harmonic functions $H_i(\vec{x})$.

In the next section we shall interpret black holes of this form as BPS saturated states namely as quantum states filling special irreducible representations of the supersymmetry algebra, the so called *short supermultiplets*, the shortening condition being precisely the saturation of the cosmic censorship bound (1.1.4). Indeed such a bound can be restated as the equality of the mass with the central charge which occurs when a certain fraction of the supersymmetry charges identically annihilate the state. The remaining supercharges applied to the BPS state build up a unitary irreducible representation of supersymmetry that is shorter than the typical one since it contains less states. As we stress in the next section it is precisely this interpretation what makes extremal black holes relevant to the string theorist. Indeed these classical solutions behave as *the other half* of the particle spectrum of superstring theory, the half not accessible to perturbative string theory.

When in the above sentence we said *classical solutions* we should have specified of which theory. The answer to this question is *supergravity*, that is the low energy effective field theory of superstrings. The *other half* of the quantum particle spectrum, the non perturbative one, is actually mostly composed of classical solutions of supergravity. This miracle, as we shall further explain in the next section 1.2, is once again due to the BPS condition which protects these classical solutions from quantum corrections.

Furthermore we said *particles*. In modern parlance particles are just 0–branes, namely a particular instance of p–dimensional extended objects (the p–branes) that occur as quantum states in the non perturbative superstring spectrum and can be retrieved as classical solutions of effective supergravity in D space–time dimensions. If we confine our attention to space–time dimensions $D = 4$ we have only 0–branes, but these are in fact extended p–branes that have *wrapped* along homology cycles of the compactified dimensions. We shall elaborate on this point in chapter 2. In the p–brane picture one divides the space–time coordinates in two subsets, those belonging to the *world volume* spanned by the moving brane and those *transverse* to it. The p–brane metric depends on space–time coordinates only through harmonic functions of the transverse coordinates. For 0–branes the world volume consists only of the time t and the

above general feature is precisely that displayed by the extremal Reissner Nordstrom metric (1.1.6).

Hence to our reader whose background is classical general relativity or quantum gravity and who approaches the notion of supergravity p–branes for the first time we can just point out the following

Statement 1.1.1 *The extremal Reissner Nordstrom metric (1.1.2) where $m = |q|$, once rewritten as in eq.(1.1.6) is the prototype of the BPS saturated black holes treated in these lectures.*

1.2 Extremal Black–Holes as quantum BPS states

In the previous section we have reviewed the idea of extremal black holes as it arises in classical general relativity. Extremal black–holes have become objects of utmost relevance in the context of superstrings after *the second string revolution* has taken place in 1995. Indeed supersymmetric extremal black–holes have been studied in depth in a vast recent literature [2, 3, 4]. This interest is just part of a more general interest in the p–brane classical solutions of supergravity theories in all dimensions $4 \leq D \leq 11$ [14, 5]. This interest streams from the interpretation of the classical solutions of supergravity that preserve a fraction of the original supersymmetries as the BPS non perturbative states necessary to complete the perturbative string spectrum and make it invariant under the many conjectured duality symmetries [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Extremal black–holes and their parent p–branes in higher dimensions are therefore viewed as additional *particle–like* states that compose the spectrum of a fundamental quantum theory. The reader of these notes who has a background in classical general relativity and astrophysics should be advised that the holes we are discussing here are neither stellar–mass, nor mini–black holes: their mass is typically of the order of the Planck–mass:

$$M_{Black\ Hole} \sim M_{Planck} \tag{1.2.1}$$

The Schwarzschild radius is therefore microscopic.

Yet, as the monopoles in gauge theories, these non–perturbative quantum states originate from regular solutions of the classical field equations, the same Einstein equations one deals with in classical general relativity and astrophysics. The essential new ingredient, in this respect, is supersymmetry that requires the presence of *vector fields* and *scalar fields* in appropriate proportions. Hence the black–holes we are going to discuss are solutions of generalized Einstein–Maxwell–dilaton equations.

The above mentioned identification between classical p–brane solutions (black–holes are instances of 0–branes) and the non–perturbative quantum states of string theory required by duality has become quite circumstantial with the advent of D–branes [11] and the possibility raised by them of a direct construction of the BPS states within the language of perturbative string theory extended by the choice of Dirichlet boundary conditions [12].

Basic feature of the non–perturbative states of the string spectrum is that they can carry Ramond–Ramond charges forbidden at the perturbative level. On the other hand, the important observation by Hull and Townsend [9, 8] is that at the level of the low energy supergravity lagrangians all fields of both the Neveu-Schwarz,Neveu-Schwarz (NS-NS) and the Ramond-Ramond (R-R) sector are unified by the group of duality transformations U which is also the isometry group of the homogenous scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar} = U/H$. At least this is true in

theories with sufficiently large number of supersymmetries that is with $N \geq 3$ in $D = 4$ or, in a dimensional reduction invariant language with #supercharges $\geq$ 12. This points out that the distinction between R-R and NS-NS sectors is just an artifact of perturbative string theory. It also points out to the fact that the unifying symmetry between the perturbative and non-perturbative sectors is already known from supergravity, namely it is the U-duality group. Indeed the basic conjecture of Hull and Townsend is that the restriction to integers $U(\mathbb{Z})$ of the U Lie group determined by supergravity should be an exact symmetry of non-perturbative string theory.

From an abstract viewpoint BPS saturated states are characterized by the fact that they preserve, in modern parlance, 1/2 (or 1/4, or 1/8) of the original supersymmetries. What this actually means is that there is a suitable projection operator $\mathbb{P}^2_{BPS} = \mathbb{P}_{BPS}$ acting on the supersymmetry charge Q_{SUSY}, such that:

$$(\mathbb{P}_{BPS}\, Q_{SUSY}) \,|\, \text{BPS state} >= 0 \tag{1.2.2}$$

Since the supersymmetry transformation rules of any supersymmetric field theory are linear in the first derivatives of the fields eq.(1.2.2) is actually a *system of first order differential equations*. This system has to be combined with the second order field equations of supergravity and the common solutions to both system of equations is a classical BPS saturated state. That it is actually an exact state of non–perturbative string theory follows from supersymmetry representation theory. The classical BPS state is by definition an element of a *short supermultiplet* and, if supersymmetry is unbroken, it cannot be renormalized to a *long supermultiplet*.

Translating eq. (1.2.2) into an explicit first order differential system requires knowledge of the supersymmetry transformation rules of supergravity. These latter have a rich geometrical structure that is the purpose of the present lectures to illustrate to an audience assumed to be unfamiliar with supergravity theory. Indeed the geometrical structure of supergravity which originates in its scalar sector is transferred into the physics of extremal black holes by the BPS saturation condition.

In order to grasp the significance of the above statement let us first rapidly review, as an example, the algebraic definition of $D = 4$ BPS states in a theory with an even number of supercharges $N = 2\nu$. The case with $N =$ odd can be similarly treated but needs some minor modifications due to the fact the eigenvalues of an antisymmetric matrix in odd dimensions are $\{\pm \mathrm{i}\lambda_i, 0\}$.

1.2.1 General definition of BPS states in a 4D theory with $N = 2 \times p$ supersymmetries

The $D = 4$ supersymmetry algebra with $N = 2 \times p$ supersymmetry charges is given by

$$\left\{\overline{Q}_{A\alpha}\,,\, \overline{Q}_{B\beta}\right\} = \mathrm{i}\,(\mathbf{C}\,\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta}\, P_\mu\, \delta_{AB} \;-\; \mathbf{C}_{\alpha\beta}\, \mathbf{Z}_{AB} \qquad (A, B = 1, \ldots, 2p) \tag{1.2.3}$$

where the SUSY charges $\overline{Q}_A \equiv Q^\dagger_A \gamma_0 = Q^T_A\, \mathbf{C}$ are Majorana spinors, $\mathbf{C}$ is the charge conjugation matrix, P_μ is the 4–momentum operator and the antisymmetric tensor $\mathbf{Z}_{AB} = -\mathbf{Z}_{BA}$ is the

central charge operator. It can always be reduced to normal form

$$\mathbf{Z}_{AB} \quad = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon Z_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon Z_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \epsilon Z_p \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.2.4}$$

where ϵ is the 2×2 antisymmetric matrix, (every zero is a 2×2 zero matrix) and the p skew eigenvalues Z_I of $\mathbf{Z}_{AB}$ are the central charges.

If we identify each index $A, B, \dots$ with a pair of indices

$$A = (a, I) \quad ; \quad a, b, \dots = 1, 2 \quad ; \quad I, J, \dots = 1, \dots, p \tag{1.2.5}$$

then the superalgebra (1.2.3) can be rewritten as:

$$\left\{ \overline{Q}_{aI|\alpha} \, , \, \overline{Q}_{bJ|\beta} \right\} \, = \, \mathrm{i} \, (C \, \gamma^{\mu})_{\alpha\beta} \; P_{\mu} \, \delta_{ab} \, \delta_{IJ} \, - \, C_{\alpha\beta} \, \epsilon_{ab} \, \times \, \mathbb{Z}_{IJ} \tag{1.2.6}$$

where the SUSY charges $\overline{Q}_{aI} \equiv Q^{\dagger}_{aI} \gamma_0 = Q^{T}_{aI} \, C$ are Majorana spinors, C is the charge conjugation matrix, P_{μ} is the 4–momentum operator, ϵ_{ab} is the two–dimensional Levi Civita symbol and the central charge operator is now represented by the *symmetric tensor* $\mathbb{Z}_{IJ} = \mathbb{Z}_{JI}$ which can always be diagonalized $\mathbb{Z}_{IJ} = \delta_{IJ} \, Z_J$. The p eigenvalues Z_J are the skew eigenvalues introduced in equation (1.2.4).

The Bogomolny bound on the mass of a generalized monopole state:

$$M \, \geq \, | \, Z_I | \qquad \forall Z_I \, , \, I = 1, \dots, p \tag{1.2.7}$$

is an elementary consequence of the supersymmetry algebra and of the identification between *central charges* and *topological charges*. To see this it is convenient to introduce the following reduced supercharges:

$$\overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI|\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} \, \left(\overline{Q}_{aI} \gamma_0 \pm \mathrm{i} \, \epsilon_{ab} \, \overline{Q}_{bI} \right)_{\alpha} \tag{1.2.8}$$

They can be regarded as the result of applying a projection operator to the supersymmetry charges:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI} \quad &= \quad \overline{Q}_{bI} \, \mathbb{P}^{\pm}_{ba} \\ \mathbb{P}^{\pm}_{ba} \quad &= \quad \frac{1}{2} \, (\mathbf{1} \delta_{ba} \pm \mathrm{i} \epsilon_{ba} \gamma_0) \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.9}$$

Combining eq.(1.2.6) with the definition (1.2.8) and choosing the rest frame where the four momentum is $P_{\mu} = (M, 0, 0, 0)$, we obtain the algebra:

$$\left\{ \overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI} \, , \, \overline{S}^{\pm}_{bJ} \right\} = \pm \epsilon_{ac} \, C \, \mathbb{P}^{\pm}_{cb} \, (M \mp Z_I) \, \delta_{IJ} \tag{1.2.10}$$

By positivity of the operator $\left\{ \overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI} \, , \, \overline{S}^{\pm}_{bJ} \right\}$ it follows that on a generic state the Bogomolny bound (1.2.7) is fulfilled. Furthermore it also follows that the states which saturate the bounds:

$$(M \pm Z_I) \; | \text{BPS state}, i \rangle = 0 \tag{1.2.11}$$

are those which are annihilated by the corresponding reduced supercharges:

$$\overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI} \, |\text{BPS state},i\rangle = 0 \tag{1.2.12}$$

On one hand eq.(1.2.12) defines *short multiplet representations* of the original algebra (1.2.6) in the following sense: one constructs a linear representation of (1.2.6) where all states are identically annihilated by the operators $\overline{S}^{\pm}_{aI}$ for $I = 1, \ldots, n_{max}$. If $n_{max} = 1$ we have the minimum shortening, if $n_{max} = p$ we have the maximum shortening. On the other hand eq.(1.2.12) can be translated into a first order differential equation on the bosonic fields of supergravity.

Indeed, let us consider a configuration where all the fermionic fields are zero. Setting the fermionic SUSY rules appropriate to such a background equal to zero we find the following Killing spinor equation:

$$0 = \delta\text{fermions} = \text{SUSY rule}\,(\text{bosons}, \epsilon_{AI}) \tag{1.2.13}$$

where the SUSY parameter satisfies the following conditions [1]:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \xi^{\mu} \, \gamma_{\mu} \, \epsilon_{aI} & = & \mathrm{i} \, \varepsilon_{ab} \, \epsilon^{bI} & ; \quad I = 1, \ldots, n_{max} \\ \epsilon_{aI} & = & 0 & ; \quad I > n_{max} \end{array} \tag{1.2.14}$$

Hence eq.s (1.2.13) with a parameter satisfying the condition (1.2.14) will be our operative definition of BPS states.

1.3 The Horizon Area and Central Charges

In the main body of these lectures we are going to see how eq.s (1.2.13) can be translated into explicit differential equations. Solving such first order equations, together with the second order Einstein Maxwell equations we can obtain BPS saturated black hole solutions of the various versions of supergravity theory. This programme requires the use of the rich and complex structure of supergravity lagrangians. In these lectures, however we do not dwell on the technicalities of supersymmetry theory and except for the supersymmetry transformations rules needed to write (1.2.13) we almost nowhere else mention the fermionic fields. What we rather explain in detail the geometric symplectic structure of the supergravity lagrangians related to the simultaneous presence of *vector* and *scalar* fields, the latter interpreted á la σ–model as coordinates of a suitable scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$. This symplectic structure which is enforced by supersymmetry and which allows the definition of generalized *electric–magnetic duality rotations* fits into a rather general pattern and it is responsible for the most fascinating and most intriguing result in the analysis of supergravity BPS black holes: the interpretation of the horizon area appearing in the Beckenstein–Hawking formula (1.1.1) as a *topological U–duality invariant* depending only on the magnetic and electric charges of the hole.

If we go back to our prototype metric (1.1.2) and we calculate the area of the horizon, we find:

$$\text{Area}_H = \int_{\rho=\rho_+} \sqrt{g_{\theta\theta} \, g_{\phi\phi}} \, d\theta \, d\phi \; = \; 4\pi \, \rho_+^2 \; = \; 4\pi \, \left(m + \sqrt{m^2 - |q|^2} \right)^2 \tag{1.3.1}$$

[1] ξ^{μ} denotes a time–like Killing vector

In the case of an extremal black–hole ($m = |q|$) eq.(1.3.1) becomes:

$$\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} = |q|^2 \tag{1.3.2}$$

The rather innocent looking formula (1.3.2) contains a message of the utmost relevance. For BPS black holes the horizon area and hence the entropy is a function solely of the electric and magnetic charges of the hole. It is also a very specific function, since it is an algebraic invariant of a duality group. But this is difficult to be seen in a too simple theory where there is just one electromagnetic field. Eq.(1.3.2) reveals its hidden surprising structure when it is generalized to a theory containing several vector fields interacting with gravity and scalars within the symplectic scheme enforced by supersymmetry and proper to the supergravity lagrangians.

Explaining the generalization of eq.(1.3.2) both at a general level and in explicit examples taken from the maximally extended supergravity theory ($N = 8$) is the main purpose of this series of lectures.

Chapter 2

SUPERGRAVITY p–BRANES IN HIGHER DIMENSIONS

As we already stressed, in line with the topics of this school, our main goal is to classify BPS *black hole solutions* of $4D$ supergravity and to unravel the fascinating group theoretical structure of their Bekenstein Hawking entropy.

Black holes are instances of 0–branes, namely objects with zero–dimensional space–like extension that can evolve in time. They carry *quantized electric and magnetic charges* $\{q_\Sigma, p^\Lambda\}$ under the host of gauge–fields A^Λ_μ $(\Lambda = 1, \ldots, \overline{n})$ appearing in the spectrum of supergravity, that is the low energy effective theory of strings, or M–theory. As we shall see, the entropy

$$S_{BH} \,=\, \mathcal{S}\,(q,p) \tag{2.0.1}$$

is a topological invariant that depends solely on such quantized charges. Actually it is not only a topological invariant insensitive to continuous deformations of the black–hole solution with respect to the parameters it depends on (*the moduli*) but also an invariant in the group–theoretical sense. Indeed $\mathcal{S}\,(q,p)$ is an invariant of the U–duality group that unifies the various perturbative and non–perturbative duality of string theory. Such a complicated structure of the black hole arises from the compactification of too many of the actual dimensions of space–time. The black-hole appears to us as a 0–brane only because its spatial extension has been hidden in the six (or seven) dimensional compact manifold $\mathcal{M}_{comp}$ that is not directly accessible at low energies. The 0–brane black–hole is actually a p–brane (or intersection of many p–branes) that are *wrapped* on the homology p–cycles of the internal manifold $\mathcal{M}_{comp}$.

So although our main focus will be on the $D = 4$ theory, in order to get a better insight into the meaning of such complicated objects as we propose to study, it is appropriate to start from the vantage point of higher dimensions $D > 4$ where p–branes become much simpler by freely unfolding into non compact directions.

2.1 Definition and general features of dilatonic p–brane solutions in dimension D

The basic idea of a p–brane solution can be illustrated by considering a very simple action functional in D space-time dimensions that contains just only three fields:

1. the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, namely the *graviton*
2. a scalar field $\phi(X)$, namely the *dilaton*
3. a $p+1$-form gauge field $A_{[p+1]} \equiv A_{M_1 \ldots M_{p+1}} dX^{M_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge dX^M_{p+1}$.

Explicitly we write :

$$I_D = \int d^D x \sqrt{-g}\, [R - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_M \phi \nabla^M \phi - \frac{1}{2n!} e^{a\phi} F^2_{[p+2]}] \tag{2.1.1}$$

where $F_{[p+2]} \equiv dA_{[p+1]}$ is the field strength of the $p+1$–form gauge potential and a is some real number whose profound meaning will become clear in the later discussion of the solutions. For various values of

$$n = p + 2 \quad \text{and} \quad a \tag{2.1.2}$$

the functional I_D is a consistent truncation of some supergravity bosonic action S_D^{SUGRA} in dimension D. By consistent truncation we mean that a subset of the bosonic fields have been put equal to zero but in such a way that all solutions of the truncated action are also solutions of the complete one. For instance if we choose:

$$a = 1 \qquad n = \begin{cases} 3 \\ 7 \end{cases} \tag{2.1.3}$$

eq.(2.1.1) corresponds to the bosonic low energy action of $D = 10$ heterotic superstring (N=1, supergravity) where the $E_8 \times E_8$ gauge fields have been deleted. The two choices 3 or 7 in eq.(2.1.3) correspond to the two formulations (electric/magnetic) of the theory. Other choices correspond to truncations of the type IIA or type IIB action in the various intermediate dimensions $4 \leq D \leq 10$. Since the $n-1$–form $A_{[n-1]}$ couples to the world volume of an extended object of dimension:

$$p = n - 2 \tag{2.1.4}$$

namely a p–brane, the choice of the truncated action (2.1.1) is motivated by the search for p–brane solutions of supergravity. According with the interpretation (2.1.4) we set:

$$n = p + 2 \qquad d = p + 1 \qquad \widetilde{d} = D - p - 3 \tag{2.1.5}$$

where d is the world–volume dimension of an electrically charged *elementary* p–brane solution, while $\widetilde{d}$ is the world–volume dimension of a magnetically charged *solitonic* $\widetilde{p}$–brane with $\widetilde{p} = D - p - 4$. The distinction between elementary and solitonic is the following. In the elementary case the field configuration we shall discuss is a true vacuum solution of the field equations following from the action (2.1.1) everywhere in D–dimensional space–time except for a singular locus of dimension d. This locus can be interpreted as the location of an elementary p–brane source that is coupled to supergravity via an electric charge spread over its own world volume. In the solitonic case, the field configuration we shall consider is instead a bona–fide solution of the supergravity field equations everywhere in space–time without the need to postulate external elementary sources. The field energy is however concentrated around a locus of dimension $\widetilde{p}$. These solutions have been derived and discussed thoroughly in the literature [13]. Good reviews of such results are [14, 15]. Defining:

$$\Delta = a^2 + 2\, \frac{d\widetilde{d}}{D-2} \tag{2.1.6}$$

it was shown in [13] that the action (2.1.1) admits the following elementary p–brane solution

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{-\frac{4\,\widetilde{d}}{\Delta(D-2)}}\, dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu\, \eta_{\mu\nu} - \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{\frac{4\,d}{\Delta(D-2)}}\, dy^m \otimes dy^n\, \delta_{mn} \\ F &= \lambda(-)^{p+1}\epsilon_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_{p+1}} dx^{\mu_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge dx^{\mu_{p+1}}\wedge \frac{y^m\, dy^m}{r}\,\left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{-2}\,\frac{1}{r^{\widetilde{d}+1}} \\ e^{\phi(r)} &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{-\frac{2a}{\Delta}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.7}$$

where the coordinates X^M ($M = 0, 1\ldots, D-1$ have been split into two subsets:

- x^μ, ($\mu = 0,\ldots,p$) are the coordinates on the p–brane world–volume,
- y^m, ($m = D-d+1,\ldots,D$) are the coordinates transverse to the brane

By $r \equiv \sqrt{y^m y_m}$ we denote the radial distance from the brane and by k the value of its electric charge. Finally, in eq.(2.1.7) we have set:

$$\lambda = 2\,\frac{\widetilde{d}\,k}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \tag{2.1.8}$$

The same authors of [13] show that that the action (2.1.1) admits also the following solitonic $\widetilde{p}$–brane solution:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{d}}\right)^{-\frac{4\,d}{\Delta(D-2)}}\, dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu\, \eta_{\mu\nu} - \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{d}}\right)^{\frac{4\,\widetilde{d}}{\Delta(D-2)}}\, dy^m \otimes dy^n\, \delta_{mn} \\ \widetilde{F}_{[D-n]} &= \lambda\epsilon_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_{\widetilde{d}}p} dx^{\mu_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge dx^{\mu_{\widetilde{d}}}\wedge \frac{y^p}{r^{d+2}} \\ e^{\phi(r)} &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{d}}\right)^{\frac{2a}{\Delta}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.9}$$

where the $D-p-2$–form $\widetilde{F}_{[D-n]}$ is the dual of $F_{[n]}$, k is now the magnetic charge and:

$$\lambda = -2\,\frac{\widetilde{d}\,k}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \tag{2.1.10}$$

These p–brane configurations are solutions of the second order field equations obtained by varying the action (2.1.1). However, when (2.1.1) is the truncation of a supergravity action both (2.1.7) and (2.1.9) are also the solutions of a *first order differential system of equations*. This happens because they are BPS–extremal p–branes which preserve a fraction of the original supersymmetries. As an example we consider the 10–dimensional case.

2.1.1 The elementary string solution of heterotic supergravity in $D = 10$

Here we have :

$$D = 10 \qquad d = 2 \qquad \widetilde{d} = 6 \qquad a = 1 \qquad \Delta = 4 \qquad \lambda = \pm 6k \tag{2.1.11}$$

so that the elementary string solution reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \exp[2U(r)]\, dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu - \exp[-\frac{2}{3}U(r)]\, dy^m \otimes dy^m \\ \exp[2U(r)] &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right)^{-3/4} \\ F &= 6k\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \wedge \frac{y^m dy^m}{r}\,\left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right)^{-2}\,\frac{1}{r^7} \\ \exp[\phi(r)] &= \left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right)^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.12}$$

As already pointed out, with the values (2.1.11), the action (2.1.1) is just the truncation of heterotic supergravity where, besides the fermions, also the $E_8 \times E_8$ gauge fields have been set to zero. In this theory the supersymmetry transformation rules we have to consider are those of the gravitino and of the dilatino. They read:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\psi_\mu &= \nabla_\mu \epsilon + \frac{1}{96}\,\exp[\frac{1}{2}\phi]\left(\Gamma_{\lambda\rho\sigma\mu} + 9\,\Gamma_{\lambda\rho}\, g_{\sigma\mu}\right) F^{\lambda\rho\sigma}\,\epsilon \\ \delta\chi &= \mathrm{i}\,\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\,\partial^\mu\phi\,\Gamma_\mu\epsilon - \mathrm{i}\,\frac{\sqrt{2}}{24}\,\exp[-\frac{1}{2}\phi]\,\Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\,\epsilon\, F^{\mu\nu\rho} \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.13}$$

Expressing the ten dimensional gamma matrices as tensor products of the two dimensional gamma matrices γ_μ ($\mu = 0, 1$) on the 1–brane world sheet with the eight dimensional gamma matrices Σ_m ($m = 2, \ldots, 9$) on the transverse space it is easy to check that in the background (2.1.12) the SUSY variations (2.1.13) vanish for the following choice of the parameter:

$$\epsilon = \left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right)^{-3/16} \epsilon_0 \otimes \eta_0 \tag{2.1.14}$$

where the constant spinors ϵ_0 and η_0 are respectively 2–component and 16–component and have both positive chirality:

$$\gamma_3\,\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0 \quad \Sigma_{10}\,\eta_0 = \eta_0 \tag{2.1.15}$$

Hence we conclude that the extremal p–brane solutions of all maximal (and non maximal) supergravities can be obtained by imposing the supersymmetry invariance of the background with respect to a projected SUSY parameter of the type (2.1.14).

2.2 $M2$–branes in $D = 11$ and the issue of the horizon geometry

To illustrate a very crucial feature of p–brane solutions, namely the structure of their horizon geometry, we choose another example in $D = 11$. The bosonic spectrum of $D = 11$ supergravity [16] is very simple since besides the metric g_{MN} it contains only a 3–form gauge field $A_{[3]}$ and no scalar field ϕ. This means that $a = 0$ and that there is an elementary electric 2–brane solution and a magnetically charged 5–brane, the $M2$–brane and the $M5$–brane, respectively. This universally adopted nomenclature follows from $D = 11$ supergravity being the low energy effective action of M–theory. Accordingly we have:

$$a = 0 \quad ; \quad d = 3 \quad ; \quad \widetilde{d} = 6 \quad ; \quad \Delta = 4 \quad ; \quad D = 11 \tag{2.2.1}$$

and following eq:(2.1.7) the metric corresponding to the elementary $M2$–brane can be written as:

$$ds^2_{11} \;=\; \left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{-\frac{\widetilde{d}}{9}} dx^\mu\; dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + \;\left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right)^{\frac{d}{9}} dX^I\; dX^J\, \delta_{IJ}\,. \tag{2.2.2}$$

where

$$d \;\equiv\; 3 \;\;;\;\; \widetilde{d} \;\equiv\; 11-3-2=6 \tag{2.2.3}$$

What we would like to note is that in the *bulk* of this solution, namely for generic values of r, the isometry of the 11–dimensional metric (2.2.2) is:

$$\mathcal{I}_{2-brane} \;=\; ISO(1,2) \,\otimes\, SO\,(8) \tag{2.2.4}$$

yet if we take the limiting value of this metric in the two limits

1. Infinity: $r \to \infty$
2. Horizon: $r \to 0$

then the isometry gets enhanced and we respectively obtain:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} ISO(1,10) & \text{at} & \text{infinity} \\ SO(2,3)\times SO(8) & \text{at} & \text{the horizon} \end{array} \tag{2.2.5}$$

The reason for this is simple. As one can realize by inspection, at $r=\infty$ the metric (2.2.2) becomes the flat 11-dimensional metric which obviously admits the 11D Poincaré group as isometry, while in the vicinity of $r=0$, the metric (2.2.2) is approximated by the following metric:

$$ds^2 \;=\; \rho^2(-dt^2 + d\vec{z}\cdot d\vec{z}) + \rho^{-2}d\rho^2 \;+\; d\Omega_7^2 \tag{2.2.6}$$

where the last term $d\Omega_7^2$ is the $SO(8)$ invariant metric on a 7–sphere S^7, while the previous ones correspond to a particular parametrization of the anti de Sitter metric on AdS_4, which, by definition, admits $SO(2,3)$ as isometry. To see that this is indeed the case it suffices to use polar coordinates for the eight transverse directions to the brane:

$$dy^I\, dy^J\, \delta_{IJ} \;=\; dr^2 \;+\; r^2\, d\Omega_7^2 \tag{2.2.7}$$

set $\rho = r^2$ and take the limit $\rho \to 0$ in the metric (2.2.2)

The conclusion therefore is that in the vicinity of the horizon the geometry of the $M2$–brane (2.2.2) is:

$$M_2^{hor} = AdS_4 \,\times\, S^7 \tag{2.2.8}$$

which, by itself, would be an exact solution of $D=11$ supergravity. It follows that the $M2$–brane can be seen as an M–theory *soliton*, in the usual sense of soliton theory: it is an exact solution of the field equations that interpolates smoothly between two vacua of the theory, 11D Minkowski space at infinity and the space $AdS_4 \times S^7$ at the horizon.

This feature of the $M2$–brane (2.2.2) corresponds to a very general property of p–branes and can be generalized in two ways. First we can make the following:

Statement 2.2.1 *Whenever $a = 0$ the limiting horizon geometry of an elementary or solitonic p–brane as defined in eq.(2.1.7) or eq. (2.1.9) is*

$$M_p^{hor} = AdS_{p+2} \times S^{D-p-2} \tag{2.2.9}$$

Secondly we can pursue the following

Generalization 2.2.1 *Rather than eq.s(2.1.7) or (2.1.9), as candidate solutions for the action (2.1.1) consider the following ansatz:*

$$ds^2 = e^{2A(r)} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + e^{2B(r)}[dr^2 + r^2\lambda^{-2} ds^2_{G/H}] \tag{2.2.10}$$

$$A_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_d} = \epsilon_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_d} e^{C(r)} \tag{2.2.11}$$

$$\phi = \phi(r) \tag{2.2.12}$$

where

1. *λ is a constant parameter with the dimensions of length.*

2. *The D coordinates X^M are split as follows: $X^M = (x^\mu, r, y^m)$, $\eta^{MN} = diag(-,+++...)$*

3. *$\mu = 0, \ldots, d-1$ runs on the p-brane world-volume ($d = p+1$)*

4. *$\bullet$ labels the r coordinate*

5. *$m = d+1, \ldots, D-1$ runs on some $D-d-1$-dimensional compact coset manifold G/H, G being a compact Lie group and $H \subset G$ a closed Lie subgroup.*

6. *$ds^2_{G/H}$ denotes a G–invariant metric on the above mentioned coset manifold.*

The basic difference with respect to the previous case is that we have replaced the invariant metric $ds^2_{S^{D-d-1}}$ on a sphere S^{D-d-1} by the more general coset manifold metric $ds^2_{G/H}$. With such an ansatz exact solutions can be found as it was shown in [17]. If $a = 0$, namely if there is no dilaton, such G/H p–branes have as horizon geometry:

$$M_p^{hor} = AdS_{p+2} \times \left(\frac{G}{H}\right)_{D-p-2} \tag{2.2.13}$$

and their horizon symmetry is:

$$SO(2, p+1) \times G \tag{2.2.14}$$

Applied to the case of $D = 11$ supergravity, the electric ansatz in eq.s (2.2.10),(2.2.11) produces G/H M2–brane solutions. For pedagogical purposes we describe the derivation of such solutions in a little detail.

2.2.1 Derivation of the G/H M2-brane solution

The field equations derived from (2.1.1) have the following form:

$$R_{MN} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_M\phi\partial_N\phi + S_{MN} \tag{2.2.15}$$

$$\nabla_{M_1}(e^{a\phi}F^{M_1\dots M_n}) = 0 \tag{2.2.16}$$

$$\Box\phi = \frac{a}{2n!}F^2 \tag{2.2.17}$$

where S_{MN} is the energy-momentum tensor of the n-form F:

$$S_{MN} = \frac{1}{2(n-1)!}e^{a\phi}[F_{M\dots}F_N{}^{\dots} - \frac{n-1}{n(D-2)}F^2 g_{MN}] \tag{2.2.18}$$

The Vielbein

In order to prove that the ansatz (2.2.10)-(2.2.12) is a solution of the field equations it is necessary to calculate the corresponding vielbein, spin–connection and curvature tensors. We use the convention that tangent space indices are underlined. Then the vielbein components relative to the ansatz (2.2.10) are:

$$E^{\underline{\mu}} = e^A dx^\mu;\ E^{\underline{\bullet}} = e^B dr;\quad E^{\underline{m}} = e^B r\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{E}^{\underline{m}}; \tag{2.2.19}$$

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^{2A}\eta_{\mu\nu};\quad g_{\bullet\bullet} = e^{2B},\quad g_{mn} = e^{2B}r^2\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{g}_{mn} \tag{2.2.20}$$

with $\mathbf{E}^{\underline{m}} \equiv G/H$ vielbein and $\mathbf{g}_{mn} \equiv G/H$ metric.

The spin connection

The Levi–Civita spin–connection on our D–dimensional manifold is defined as the solution of the vanishing torsion equation:

$$dE^{\underline{M}} + \omega^{\underline{M}}{}_{\underline{N}} \wedge E^{\underline{N}} = 0 \tag{2.2.21}$$

Solving eq.(2.2.21) explicitly we obtain the spin–connection components:

$$\omega^{\underline{\mu\nu}} = 0,\quad \omega^{\underline{\mu\bullet}} = e^{-B}A'E^{\underline{\mu}},\quad \omega^{\underline{\mu n}} = 0,\quad \omega^{\underline{mn}} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\underline{mn}},\quad \omega^{\underline{m\bullet}} = \exp[-B]\,(B' + r^{-1})E^{\underline{m}}. \tag{2.2.22}$$

where $A' \equiv \partial_\bullet A$ etc. and $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\underline{mn}}$ is the spin connection of the G/H manifold.

The Ricci tensor

From the definition of the curvature 2-form :

$$R^{\underline{MN}} = d\omega^{\underline{MN}} + \omega^{\underline{M}}{}_{\underline{S}} \wedge \omega^{\underline{SN}} \tag{2.2.23}$$

we find the Ricci tensor components:

$$R_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu}e^{2(A-B)}[A'' + d(A')^2 + \widetilde{d}A'B' + (\widetilde{d}+1)r^{-1}A'] \tag{2.2.24}$$

$$R_{\bullet\bullet} = -\frac{1}{2}[d(A'' + (A')^2 - A'B') + (\widetilde{d}+1)(B'' + r^{-1}B')] \tag{2.2.25}$$

$$R_{mn} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}_{mn}\frac{r^2}{\lambda^2}[dA'(B' + r^{-1}) + r^{-1}B' + B'' + \widetilde{d}(B' + r^{-1})^2] + \mathbf{R}_{mn} \tag{2.2.26}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{mn}$ is the Ricci tensor of G/H manifold, and $\widetilde{d} \equiv D - d - 2$.

The field equations

Inserting the electric ansatz into the field eq.s (2.2.15) yields:

$$A'' + d(A')^2 + \widetilde{d}A'B' + (\widetilde{d}+1)A'r^{-1} = \frac{\widetilde{d}}{2(D-2)}S^2 \tag{2.2.27}$$

$$d[A'' + (A')^2 - A'B'] + (\widetilde{d}+1)[B'' + r^{-1}B'] = \frac{\widetilde{d}}{2(D-2)}S^2 - \frac{(\phi')^2}{2} \tag{2.2.28}$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{mn}[dA'(B'+r^{-1}) + r^{-1}B' + B'' + \widetilde{d}(B'+r^{-1})^2] - 2\mathbf{R}_{mn} = - \frac{d}{2(D-2)}\mathbf{g}_{mn}S^2 \tag{2.2.29}$$

while eq.s (2.2.16)-(2.2.17) become:

$$C'' + (\widetilde{d}+1)r^{-1}C' + (\widetilde{d}B' - dA' + C' + a\phi')C' = 0 \tag{2.2.30}$$

$$\phi'' + (\widetilde{d}+1)r^{-1}\phi' + [dA' + \widetilde{d}B']\phi' = -\frac{a}{2}S^2 \tag{2.2.31}$$

with

$$S \equiv e^{\frac{1}{2}a\phi + C - dA}C' \tag{2.2.32}$$

2.2.2 Construction of the BPS Killing spinors in the case of $D = 11$ supergravity

At this point we specialize our analysis to the case of $D = 11$ supergravity, whose action in the bosonic sector reads:

$$I_{11} = \int d^{11}x\sqrt{-g}\ (R - \frac{1}{48}F^2_{[4]}) + \frac{1}{6}\int F_{[4]} \wedge F_{[4]} \wedge A_{[3]} \tag{2.2.33}$$

and we look for the further restrictions imposed on the electric ansatz by the requirement that the solutions should preserve a certain amount of supersymmetry. This is essential for our goal since we are interested in G/H M–branes that are BPS saturated states and the BPS condition requires the existence of Killing spinors.

As discussed in ref. [14], the above action does not fall exactly in the general class of actions of type (2.1.1). Nevertheless, the results of sections 2.1 and 2.2 still apply: indeed it is straightforward to verify that the FFA term in the action (2.2.33) gives no contribution to the field equations once the electric or magnetic ansatz are implemented. Moreover no scalar fields are present in (2.2.33): this we handle by simply setting to zero the scalar coupling parameter a.

Imposing that the ansatz solution admits Killing spinors allows to simplify the field equations drastically.

We recall the supersymmetry transformation for the gravitino:

$$\delta\psi_M = \widetilde{D}_M\epsilon \tag{2.2.34}$$

with

$$\widetilde{D}_M = \partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{AB}\Gamma_{AB} - \frac{1}{288}[\Gamma^{PQRS}_{\quad M} + 8\Gamma^{PQR}\delta^S_M]F_{PQRS} \tag{2.2.35}$$

Requiring that setting $\psi_M = 0$ be consistent with the existence of residual supersymmetry yields:

$$\delta\psi_{M\,|\psi=0} = \widetilde{D}_M\epsilon = 0 \tag{2.2.36}$$

Solutions $\epsilon(x, r, y)$ of the above equation are *Killing spinor* fields on the bosonic background described by our ansatz.

In order to discuss the solutions of (2.2.36) we adopt the following tensor product realization of the (32×32) $SO(1, 10)$ gamma matrices:

$$\Gamma_A = [\gamma_\mu \otimes \mathbb{1}_8, \gamma_3 \otimes \mathbb{1}_8, \gamma_5 \otimes \Gamma_m] \tag{2.2.37}$$

The above basis (2.2.37) is well adapted to our (3+1+7) ansatz. The γ_μ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) are usual $SO(1, 3)$ gamma matrices, $\gamma_5 = i\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$, while Γ_m are 8×8 gamma matrices realizing the Clifford algebra of $SO(7)$. Thus for example $\Gamma_\bullet = \gamma_3 \otimes \mathbb{1}_8$.

Correspondingly, we split the D=11 spinor ϵ as follows

$$\epsilon = \varepsilon \otimes \eta(r, y) \tag{2.2.38}$$

where ε is an $SO(1, 3)$ constant spinor, while the $SO(7)$ spinor η, besides the dependence on the internal G/H coordinates y^m, is assumed to depend also on the radial coordinate r. Note the difference with respect to Kaluza Klein supersymmetric compactifications where η depends only on y^m. Computing $\widetilde{D}$ in the ansatz background yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{D}_\mu &= \partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2}e^{-B-2A}\gamma_\mu\gamma_3[e^{3A}A' - \frac{i}{3}e^C C'\gamma_3\gamma_5] \otimes \mathbb{1}_8 \\
\widetilde{D}_\bullet &= \partial_r + \frac{i}{6}e^{-3A}C'e^C\gamma_3\gamma_5 \otimes \mathbb{1}_8 \\
\widetilde{D}_m &= \mathcal{D}^{G/H}_m + \frac{r}{2\lambda}[(B' + r^{-1})i\gamma_3\gamma_5 + \frac{1}{6}e^{C-3A}C'] \otimes \Gamma_m
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.39}$$

where all γ_μ, Γ_m have tangent space indices. The Killing spinor equation $\widetilde{D}_\mu\epsilon = 0$ becomes equivalent to:

$$(1_4 - i\gamma_3\gamma_5)\varepsilon = 0; \quad 3e^{3A}A' = e^C C' \tag{2.2.40}$$

Thus half of the components of the 4-dim spinor ε are projected out. Moreover the second equation is solved by $C = 3A$. Considering next $\widetilde{D}_\bullet\epsilon = 0$ leads to the equation (where we have used $C = 3A$):

$$\partial_r\eta + \frac{1}{6}C'\eta = 0 \tag{2.2.41}$$

whose solution is

$$\eta(r, y) = e^{-C(r)/6}\eta_\circ(y) \tag{2.2.42}$$

Finally, $\widetilde{D}_m\epsilon = 0$ implies

$$B = -\frac{1}{6}C + const. \tag{2.2.43}$$

$$[\mathcal{D}^{G/H}_m + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\Gamma_m]\eta_\circ = 0 \tag{2.2.44}$$

Eq.(2.2.44) deserves attentive consideration. If we identify the Freund–Rubin parameter as:

$$e \equiv \frac{1}{2\lambda} \tag{2.2.45}$$

then eq.(2.2.44) is nothing else but the Killing spinor equation for a G/H spinor that one encounters while discussing the residual supersymmetry of Freund–Rubin vacua. Freund–Rubin vacua [18] are exact solutions od D=11 supergravity where the 11–dimensional space is:

$$\mathcal{M}_{11} \;=\; AdS_4 \;\times\; \left(\frac{G}{H}\right)_7 \tag{2.2.46}$$

having denoted by $AdS_D = SO(2, D-1)/SO(1, D-1)$ anti de Sitter space in dimension D and by $\left(\frac{G}{H}\right)_7$ a 7–dimensional coset manifold equipped with a G–invariant Einstein metric. Such a metric solves the field equations under the condition that the 4–form field strength take a constant $SO(1,3)$-invariant vev:

$$F_{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4} = e\,\epsilon_{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4} \tag{2.2.47}$$

on AdS_4. The Freund Rubin vacua have been exhaustively studied in the old literature on Kaluza–Klein supergravity (see [16] for a comprehensive review) and are all known. Furthermore it is also known how many killing spinors each of them admits: such a number is denoted $N_{G/H}$.

In this way we have explicitly verified that the number of BPS Killing spinors admitted by the G/H M–brane solution is $N_{G/H}$, i.e. the number of Killing spinors admitted by the corresponding Freund–Rubin vacuum.

2.2.3 M-brane solution

To be precise the Killing spinors of the previous section are admitted by a configuration that has still to be shown to be a complete solution of the field equations. To prove this is immediate. Setting $D = 11, d = 3, \widetilde{d} = 6$, the scalar coupling parameter $a = 0$, and using the relations $C = 3A, B = -C/6 + const. = -A/2 + const.$ we have just deduced, the field equations (2.2.27), (2.2.28), (2.2.29) become:

$$A'' + 7r^{-1}A' = \frac{1}{3}S^2 \tag{2.2.48}$$

$$(A')^2 = \frac{1}{6}S^2 \tag{2.2.49}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{mn} = \frac{3}{\lambda^2}\mathbf{g}_{mn} \tag{2.2.50}$$

Combining the first two equations to eliminate S^2 yields:

$$\nabla^2 A - 3(A')^2 \equiv A'' + \frac{7}{r}A' - 3(A')^2 = 0 \tag{2.2.51}$$

or:

$$\nabla^2 e^{-3A} = 0 \tag{2.2.52}$$

whose solution is:

$$e^{-3A(r)} = H(r) = 1 + \frac{k}{r^6} \tag{2.2.53}$$

We have chosen the integration constant such that $A(\infty) = 0$. The functions $B(r)$ and $C(r)$ are then given by $B = -A/2$ (so that $B(\infty) = 0$) and $C = 3A$. Finally, after use of $C = 3A$, the F-field equation (2.2.30) becomes equivalent to (2.2.51). The equation (2.2.52) determining the radial dependence of the function $A(r)$ (and consequently of $B(r)$ and $C(r)$) is the same here as in the case of ordinary branes, while to solve eq.(2.2.50) it suffices to choose for the manifold G/H the G–invariant Einstein metric. Each of the Freund–Rubin cosets admits such an Einstein metric which was also constructed in the old Kaluza–Klein supergravity literature (see [19, 16])

Summarizing: for $D = 11$ supergravity the field equations are solved by the ansatz (2.2.10), (2.2.11) where the A, B, C functions are

$$\begin{aligned} A(r) &= -\frac{\widetilde{d}}{18}\,\ln\left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right) = -\frac{1}{3}\ln\left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right) \\ B(r) &= \frac{d}{18}\,\ln\left(1+\frac{k}{r^{\widetilde{d}}}\right) = \frac{1}{6}\ln\left(1+\frac{k}{r^6}\right) \\ C(r) &= 3\,A(r) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.54}$$

displaying the same r–dependence as the ordinary M–brane solution (2.2.2).

In this way we have illustrated the existence of G/H M–brane solutions (see. [20]). Table 2.2.3 displays the Freund–Rubin cosets with non vanishing $N_{G/H}$. Each of them is associated to a BPS saturated M–brane. The notations are as in ref.s [19], [16].

Table 2.1: Supersymmetric Freund Rubin Cosets with Killing spinors

G/H	G	H	$N_{G/H}$
S^7	$SO(8)$	SO(7)	8
squashed S^7	$SO(5) \times SO(3)$	$SO(3) \times SO(3)$	1
M^{ppr}	$SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$	$SU(2) \times U(1)^2$	2
N^{010}	$SU(3) \times SU(2)$	$SU(2) \times U(1)$	3
N^{pqr}	$SU(3) \times U(1)$	$U(1)^2$	1
Q^{ppp}	$SU(2)^3$	$U(1)^3$	2
B^7_{irred}	$SO(5)$	$SO(3)_{max}$	1
$V_{5,2}$	$SO(5)) \times U(1)$	$SO(3) \times U(1)$	2

Chapter 3

THE SYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE OF 4D SUPERGRAVITY AND N=2 BPS BLACK HOLES

3.1 Introduction to tetradimensional BPS black–holes and the general form of the supergravity action

In this chapter we begin the study of BPS black–hole solutions in four space-time dimensions. We mainly focus on the case of $N = 2$ supergravity, leaving the higher N–cases, in particular that of $N = 8$ supergravity to later chapters. Apart from its intrinsic interest we want to use the $N = 2$ example to illustrate the profound relation between the black-hole structure, in particular its entropy, and the scalar geometry of supergravity, together with its symplectic embedding that realizes covariance with respect to electric-magnetic duality rotations. We approach this intricate and fascinating relation starting from a general description of the nature of BPS black–hole solutions. These are field configurations satisfying the equations of motions derived from the bosonic part of the supergravity action that are characterized by the following defining properties:

1. The metric has the form of a 0–brane solution admitting $\mathbb{R} \times SO(3)$ as isometry group:

$$ds^2 = e^{2U(r)}\, dt^2 - e^{-2U(r)}\, d\vec{x}^2 \quad ; \quad \left(r^2 = \vec{x}^2\right) \tag{3.1.1}$$

2. The $\overline{n}$ gauge fields of the theory A^Λ carry both electric and magnetic charges and are in a 0–brane configuration, namely their field strengths F^Λ are of the form:

$$F^\Lambda = \frac{p^\Lambda}{2r^3}\epsilon_{abc}x^a dx^b \wedge dx^c - \frac{\ell^\Lambda(r)}{r^3}e^{2\mathcal{U}}dt \wedge \vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x} \tag{3.1.2}$$

3. The m scalar fields of the theory ϕ^I have only radial dependence:

$$\phi^I = \phi^I(r) \quad ; \quad (I = 1, \dots m) \tag{3.1.3}$$

4. The field configuration preserves a certain fraction of the original N–extended supersymmetry:
$$f_{SUSY} = \frac{N}{2\,n_{max}} \quad ; \quad (f_{SUSY}) = \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{8} \tag{3.1.4}$$
in the sense that there exists a BPS Killing spinor $\xi_A(x)$ subject to the condition:
$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^0\,\xi_A &= \mathrm{i}\mathbb{C}_{AB}\,\xi^B \quad ; \quad A,B = 1,\ldots,n_{max} \quad ; \quad 2 \leq n_{max} \leq N \\ \xi_A &= 0 \quad ; \quad A = n_{max}+1,\ldots,N \\ \mathbb{C}_{AB} &= -\mathbb{C}_{AB} \quad = \quad \text{antisymmetric matrix of rank } n_{max} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1.5}$$
such that in the considered bosonic background the supersymmetry transformation rule of all the fermions of the theory vanishes along the Killing spinor (3.1.5):
$$\delta_\epsilon^{SUSY} \text{ fermions} = 0 \quad \text{if SUSY parameter } \epsilon_A = \xi_A = \text{killing spinor} \tag{3.1.6}$$

Let us illustrate the above definition of BPS black–holes by comparison with the results of chapter 1 on higher dimensional p–branes. To make such a comparison we have to assume that only one (say $A_{[1]} \equiv A^0$) of the $\overline{n}$ gauge fields A^Λ and only one (say $\phi = \phi^1$) of the m scalar fields ϕ^I are switched on in our solution. Furthermore we have to assume that upon truncation to such fields the supergravity lagrangian takes the form (2.1.1). Under these conditions a comparison is possible and it reveals the meaning of the definition of BPS black–holes we have adopted. It will become clear that the much richer structure of 4D black–holes is due to the presence of many scalar and many vector fields and to the geometric structure of their mutual interactions completely fixed by supersymmetry.

So we begin by comparing the ansatz (3.1.1) for the 4D–metric with the general form of the metric in either an elementary or solitonic p–brane solution as given in eq.s(2.1.7) or (2.1.9). In this comparison we have also to recall eq.s (2.1.4),(2.1.5) and (2.1.6). Since the black–hole is a 0–brane in $D = 4$, we have:
$$\begin{array}{rclcrcl} d &=& 1 &;& \widetilde{d} &=& 1 \\ p &=& 0 &;& \Delta &=& a^2+1 \end{array} \tag{3.1.7}$$
and for a solution coupled to a single vector field we would expect a metric of the form:
$$ds^2 = \left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right)^{-\frac{2}{a^2+1}}\,dt^2 - \left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right)^{\frac{2}{a^2+1}}\,d\vec{x}^2 \tag{3.1.8}$$
that is precisely of the form (3.1.1) with a function U given by:
$$U(r) = -\frac{1}{a^2+1}\,\log\,H(r) \tag{3.1.9}$$
where:
$$\begin{aligned} H(r) &\equiv \left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right) \\ \Delta_3\,H(r) &= \sum_{i=1}^{3}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}\,H(r) \,=\, 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.1.10}$$

is a harmonic function depending on the charge k carried by the single vector field we have considered in this comparison.

Similarly for the single scalar field we would expect:

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} -\frac{2\,a}{a^2+1}\,\log\,H(r) & ; \quad \text{electric 0-brane} \\ \frac{2\,a}{a^2+1}\,\log\,H(r) & ; \quad \text{magnetic solitonic 0-brane;} \end{cases} \tag{3.1.11}$$

and for the field strength of the single vector field we would expect:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} F & = & -2\,\frac{k}{\sqrt{a^2+1}}\,\frac{1}{r^3}\left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right)^{-2}\,dt\,\wedge\,\vec{x}\,\cdot\,\vec{x} & ; \quad \text{electric 0-brane} \\ F & = & -2\,\frac{k}{\sqrt{a^2+1}}\,\frac{1}{r^3}\,\epsilon_{abc}\,x^a\,dx^b\,\wedge\,dx^c & ; \quad \text{magnetic solitonic 0-brane} \end{array} \tag{3.1.12}$$

Comparison of eq.s (3.1.12) with eq.s(3.1.2) shows that the ansatz we adopted is indeed consistent with the 0–brane interpretation of the black–hole upon the identifications:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \ell(r) & = & r^3\,\frac{2\sqrt{a^2+1}}{a^2-1}\,\frac{d}{dr}\,[H(r)]^{\frac{1-a^2}{1+a^2}} & ; \quad \text{electric 0-brane} \\ p & = & -\frac{4}{\sqrt{a^2+1}}\,k & ; \quad \text{magnetic solitonic 0-brane} \end{array} \tag{3.1.13}$$

At this point we must observe that for this one–vector, one–scalar coupling there are critical values of the a–parameter, namely:

$$a = \begin{cases} \sqrt{3} \implies \Delta = 4 \;;\; U = -\frac{1}{4}\,\log H(r) \;;\; \phi = \mp\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\,\log H \;;\; \begin{cases} \ell = 2\,r^3\,\frac{d}{dr}H^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ p = -k \end{cases} \\ 1 \implies \Delta = 2 \;;\; U = -\frac{1}{2}\,\log H(r) \;;\; \phi = \mp\log H \;;\; \begin{cases} \ell = -2\,r^3\,\frac{d}{dr}H^{-1} \\ p = -2\sqrt{2}\,k \end{cases} \\ 0 \implies \Delta = 1 \;;\; U = -\log H(r) \;;\; \phi = 0 \;;\; \begin{cases} \ell = -2\,r^3\,\frac{d}{dr}H \\ p = -4\,k \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{3.1.14}$$

The special property of these critical values of a is that for all of them we can write:

$$\Delta = 4\,\times\,2\,\times\,f_{SUSY} \quad ; \quad \begin{cases} f_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{2} \leftrightarrow a = \sqrt{3} \\ f_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{4} \leftrightarrow a = 1 \\ f_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{8} \leftrightarrow a = 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.1.15}$$

This numerical coincidence hints at a relation with the number of preserved supersymmetries. Indeed such a relation will be verified in the context of $N = 8$ BPS black–hole solutions where the three cases of supersymmetry fractions make sense. The other important observation is that it is only in the case $a = 0$ that our black–hole can be *dyonic*, namely that we can simultaneously assign both an electric and a magnetic part to our field strength. This is evident from eq.(3.1.14). In the other cases where $\phi(r)$ is non–vanishing it cannot be simultaneously equal to const $\times \log H(r)$ and to minus the same expression. For the value $a = 0$ the 1-vector BPS black–hole simply coincides with the extremum Reissner-Nordstrom black-hole

$$ds^2_{RN} = \left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right)^{-2}\,dt^2 - \left(1+\frac{k}{r}\right)^{2}\,d\vec{x}^2 \tag{3.1.16}$$

and for small values of r it is approximated by the horizon geometry:

$$AdS_2\,\times\,S^2 \tag{3.1.17}$$

that corresponds to the Bertotti–Robinson metric [30]:

$$ds^2_{BR} = \frac{1}{m^2_{BR}} r^2 dt^2 - m^2_{BR} \frac{dr^2}{r^2} - m^2_{BR} \left(\sin^2(\theta)\, d\phi^2 + d\theta^2 \right) \tag{3.1.18}$$

the parameter:

$$m_{BR} = |k| \tag{3.1.19}$$

being named the Bertotti–Robinson mass.

Our comparison between the higher dimensional p–brane solutions and the ansatz defining BPS black–holes in $D = 4$ is now complete. By means of this comparison we have understood the form (3.1.1) assigned to metric. It must reduce to eq.s (3.1.8), (3.1.9) when there is only one vector and only one scalar switched on. However, in the general case we are not allowed to identify directly the function $U(r)$ with the logarithm of the harmonic function $H(r)$ as in eq.(3.1.9). This is so because there are many vector fields in the theory and to each of them we can associate a different charge and hence a different harmonic function. Similarly the presence of many scalar fields does not allow to know, a priori, whether a given field strength F^Λ is electric, magnetic or dyonic. Correspondingly the general ansatz for F^Λ is that of eq.(3.1.2), the electric and magnetic parts having the form expected for 0–branes.

Finally we have to discuss why the condition defining the BPS killing spinor is given by eq.(3.1.5). This is nothing else but the transcription, on the supersymmetry parameters of the projection operator:

$$\mathbb{P}^{\pm}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{1}\, \delta^B_A \pm \mathrm{i}\, \mathbb{C}_{AB}\, \gamma_0 \right) \tag{3.1.20}$$

that acts on the supersymmetry generators in the abstract description (1.2.9).

Having illustrated the general form of the ansatz for BPS black–holes in $D = 4$ space–time dimensions, in order to proceed one needs to insert such an ansatz into

- The second order bosonic field equations of supergravity
- The Killing spinor equations (3.1.6) that follow from the supersymmetry transformations rules of the fermions and are linear in the derivatives of the bosonic fields

In this way one arrives at a coupled system of first and second order differential equations that depends crucially on two ingredients:

- **a)** The self interaction of the scalar fields, that is on the metric $g_{IJ}(\phi)$ of the scalar manifold of which the ϕ^I are interpreted as coordinates
- **b)** The non–minimal coupling between the scalars ϕ^I and the vector fields A^Λ of which the exponential coupling $\exp[a\,\phi]\, F^2_{[p+2]}$ in the action (2.1.1) is just the simplest example.

Indeed for all tetradimensional supergravities theories the bosonic action takes the following general form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \int \sqrt{-g}\, d^4x \left(2R + \mathrm{Im}\, \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Gamma} F_{\mu\nu}{}^{\Lambda} F^{\Gamma|\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{6} g_{IJ}(\phi) \partial_\mu \phi^I \partial^\mu \phi^J + \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Re}\, \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Gamma} \frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}}{\sqrt{-g}} F_{\mu\nu}{}^{\Lambda} F^{\Gamma}{}_{\rho\sigma} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1.21}$$

where, as already stated, $g_{IJ}(\phi)$ is the scalar metric on the m–dimensional scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ and

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\phi) \tag{3.1.22}$$

is a complex, symmetric, $\overline{n} \times \overline{n}$ matrix depending on the scalar fields which we name the *period matrix*. What varies, depending on the number N of supersymmetries is

1. The relative and total number of vectors and scalars, that is $\overline{n}$ and m
2. The geometry $g_{IJ}(\phi)$ and the isometry group G of the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$.

Yet the relation between this scalar geometry and the period matrix $\mathcal{N}$ has a very general and universal form. Indeed it is related to the solution of a general problem, namely *how to lift the action of the scalar manifold isometries from the scalar to the vector fields*. Such a lift is necessary because of supersymmetry since scalars and vectors generically belong to the same supermultiplet and must rotate coherently under symmetry operations. Such a problem is solved by considering a deep property inherent to lagrangians of type (3.1.21): their possible covariance with respect to generalized *electro–magnetic duality rotations*. In the next section we address this general property and we show how enforcing covariance with respect to such duality rotations leads to a determination of the period matrix $\overline{N}$. It goes without saying that the structure of $\overline{N}$ enters the black–hole equations in a crucial way so that, not too surprisingly, at the end of the day, the topological invariant associated with the hole, that is its *entropy*, is an invariant of the group of electro-magnetic duality rotations, the U–duality group. In table 3.1 we summarize the geometries of the scalar manifolds for the various values of N. In such a table the symplectic embedding of these geometries is already mentioned. What this means will become clear by working through the next section.

3.2 Duality Rotations and Symplectic Covariance

In this section, relying on the motivations given above , we review the general structure of an abelian theory of vectors and scalars displaying covariance under a group of duality rotations. The basic reference is the 1981 paper by Gaillard and Zumino [25]. A general presentation in $D = 2p$ dimensions was recently given in [26]. Here we fix $D = 4$.

We consider a theory of $\overline{n}$ gauge fields A^{Λ}_{μ}, in a $D = 4$ space–time with Lorentz signature. They correspond to a set of $\overline{n}$ differential 1–forms

$$A^{\Lambda} \equiv A^{\Lambda}_{\mu}\, dx^{\mu} \qquad (\Lambda = 1, \ldots, \overline{n}) \tag{3.2.1}$$

The corresponding field strengths and their Hodge duals are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\Lambda} &\equiv d\,A^{\Lambda} \equiv \mathcal{F}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}\, dx^{\mu} \wedge dx^{\nu} \\ \mathcal{F}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_{\mu} A^{\Lambda}_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu} A^{\Lambda}_{\mu}\right) \\ {}^{\star}F^{\Lambda} &\equiv \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}\, dx^{\mu} \wedge dx^{\nu} \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\, \mathcal{F}^{\Lambda|\rho\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.2}$$

Table 3.1: *Scalar Manifolds of Extended Supergravities*

N	# scal. in scal.m.	# scal. in vec. m.	# scal. in grav. m.	# vect. in vec. m.	# vect. in grav. m.	Γ_{cont}	$\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$
1	2 m			n		$\mathcal{I}$ $\subset Sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$	Kähler
2	4 m	2 n		n	1	$\mathcal{I}$ $\subset Sp(2n+2, \mathbb{R})$	Quaternionic $\otimes$ Special Kähler
3		6 n		n	3	$SU(3,n)$ $\subset Sp(2n+6, \mathbb{R})$	$\frac{SU(3,n)}{S(U(3)\times U(n))}$
4		6 n	2	n	6	$SU(1,1) \otimes SO(6,n)$ $\subset Sp(2n+12, \mathbb{R})$	$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes$ $\frac{SO(6,n)}{SO(6)\times SO(n)}$
5			10		10	$SU(1,5)$ $\subset Sp(20, \mathbb{R})$	$\frac{SU(1,5)}{S(U(1)\times U(5))}$
6			30		16	$SO^{\star}(12)$ $\subset Sp(32, \mathbb{R})$	$\frac{SO^{\star}(12)}{U(1)\times SU(6)}$
7, 8			70		56	$E_{7(-7)}$ $\subset Sp(128, \mathbb{R})$	$\frac{E_{7(-7)}}{SU(8)}$

Defining the space–time integration volume as

$$\mathrm{d}^4x \equiv -\frac{1}{4!}\,\varepsilon_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_4}\,dx^{\mu_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge dx^{\mu_4}\ , \tag{3.2.3}$$

we obtain

$$F^\Lambda\wedge F^\Sigma = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\,\mathcal{F}^\Lambda_{\mu\nu}\,\mathcal{F}^\Sigma_{\rho\sigma}\,d^4x \qquad ; \qquad F^\Lambda\wedge {}^\star F^\Sigma = -2\,\mathcal{F}^\Lambda_{\mu\nu}\,\mathcal{F}^{\Sigma|\mu\nu}d^4x\ . \tag{3.2.4}$$

In addition to the gauge fields let us also introduce a set of real scalar fields ϕ^I ($I=1,\ldots,m$) spanning an $\overline{m}$–dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ [1] endowed with a metric $g_{IJ}(\phi)$. Utilizing the above field content we can write the following action functional:

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{2}\int\Big\{\Big[\,\gamma_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\phi)\,F^\Lambda\wedge\star F^\Sigma + \theta_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\phi)\,F^\Lambda\wedge F^\Sigma\,\Big] + g_{IJ}(\phi)\,\partial_\mu\phi^I\,\partial^\mu\phi^J\,\mathrm{d}^4x\Big\}\ , \tag{3.2.5}$$

where the scalar fields dependent $\overline{n}\times\overline{n}$ matrix $\gamma_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\phi)$ generalizes the inverse of the squared coupling constant $\frac{1}{g^2}$ appearing in ordinary gauge theories. The field dependent matrix $\theta_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\phi)$ is instead a generalization of the *theta*–angle of quantum chromodynamics. Both γ and θ are symmetric matrices. Introducing a formal operator j that maps a field strength into its Hodge dual

$$\Big(j\,\mathcal{F}^\Lambda\Big)_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\,\mathcal{F}^{\Lambda|\rho\sigma} \tag{3.2.6}$$

and a formal scalar product

$$(G\,,\,K)\equiv G^TK \equiv \sum_{\Lambda=1}^{\overline{n}} G^\Lambda_{\mu\nu}K^{\Lambda|\mu\nu} \tag{3.2.7}$$

the total Lagrangian of eq. (3.2.5) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}^{(tot)} = \mathcal{F}^T\,(-\gamma\otimes\mathbb{1}+\theta\otimes j)\,\mathcal{F} + \frac{1}{2}\,g_{IJ}(\phi)\,\partial_\mu\phi^I\,\partial^\mu\phi^J \tag{3.2.8}$$

The operator j satisfies $j^2 = -\,\mathbb{1}$ so that its eigenvalues are $\pm\mathrm{i}$. Introducing self–dual and antiself–dual combinations

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^\pm &= \frac{1}{2}\,(\mathcal{F}\pm\mathrm{i}\,j\mathcal{F})\\ j\,\mathcal{F}^\pm &= \mp\mathrm{i}\mathcal{F}^\pm\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.9}$$

and the field–dependent symmetric matrices

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N} &= \theta\,-\,\mathrm{i}\gamma\\ \overline{\mathcal{N}} &= \theta+\mathrm{i}\gamma\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.10}$$

the vector part of the Lagrangian (3.2.8) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}_{vec} = \mathrm{i}\,\Big[\mathcal{F}^{-T}\overline{\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{F}^- - \mathcal{F}^{+T}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{F}^+\Big] \tag{3.2.11}$$

[1] Whether the ϕ^I can be arranged into complex fields is not relevant at this level of the discussion.

Introducing the new tensors

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathcal{F}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{\mp\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \mp\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathcal{F}^{\mp\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}} \tag{3.2.12}$$

which, in matrix notation, corresponds to

$$j\,\mathcal{G} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathcal{F}^{T}} = -\left(\gamma \otimes \mathbb{1} - \theta \otimes j\right)\mathcal{F} \tag{3.2.13}$$

the Bianchi identities and field equations associated with the Lagrangian (3.2.5) can be written as

$$\partial^{\mu}\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{3.2.14}$$

$$\partial^{\mu}\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{3.2.15}$$

or equivalently

$$\partial^{\mu}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{F}^{\pm\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{3.2.16}$$

$$\partial^{\mu}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{G}^{\pm\Lambda}_{\mu\nu} = 0\ . \tag{3.2.17}$$

This suggests that we introduce the $2\overline{n}$ column vector

$$\mathbf{V} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} j\,\mathcal{F} \\ j\,\mathcal{G} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2.18}$$

and that we consider general linear transformations on such a vector

$$\begin{pmatrix} j\,\mathcal{F} \\ j\,\mathcal{G} \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} j\,\mathcal{F} \\ j\,\mathcal{G} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2.19}$$

For any matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in GL(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ the new vector $\mathbf{V}'$ of *magnetic and electric* field–strengths satisfies the same equations (3.2.15) as the old one. In a condensed notation we can write

$$\partial\,\mathbf{V} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \partial\,\mathbf{V}' = 0 \tag{3.2.20}$$

Separating the self–dual and anti–self–dual parts

$$\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}^{+} + \mathcal{F}^{-}) \qquad ; \qquad \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}^{+} + \mathcal{G}^{-}) \tag{3.2.21}$$

and taking into account that we have

$$\mathcal{G}^{+} = \mathcal{N}\mathcal{F}^{+} \quad \mathcal{G}^{-} = \overline{\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{F}^{-} \tag{3.2.22}$$

the duality rotation of eq. (3.2.19) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{+} \\ \mathcal{G}^{+} \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{+} \\ \mathcal{N}\mathcal{F}^{+} \end{pmatrix} \qquad ; \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{-} \\ \mathcal{G}^{-} \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{-} \\ \overline{\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{F}^{-} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2.23}$$

The problem is that the transformation rule (3.2.23) of $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ must be consistent with the definition of the latter as variation of the Lagrangian with respect to $\mathcal{F}^{\pm}$ (see eq. (3.2.12)). This request restricts the form of the matrix $\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$. As we are going to show, Λ must belong to the symplectic subgroup of the general linear group

$$\Lambda \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \subset GL(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.2.24}$$

the subgroup $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ being defined as the set of $2\overline{n} \times 2\overline{n}$ matrices that satisfy the condition

$$\Lambda \in Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \Lambda^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{1} \\ -\mathbb{1} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{1} \\ -\mathbb{1} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.2.25}$$

that is, using $n \otimes n$ block components

$$A^T C - C^T A = B^T D - D^T B = 0 \qquad A^T D - C^T B = 1 \tag{3.2.26}$$

To prove the statement we just made, we calculate the transformed Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}'$ and then we compare its variation $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}'}{\partial \mathcal{F}'^T}$ with $\mathcal{G}^{\pm\prime}$ as it follows from the postulated transformation rule (3.2.23). To perform such a calculation we rely on the following basic idea. While the duality rotation (3.2.23) is performed on the field strengths and on their duals, also the scalar fields are transformed by the action of some diffeomorphism $\xi \in \mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar})$ of the scalar manifold and, as a consequence of that, also the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ changes. In other words given the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ we assume that there exists a homomorphism of the form

$$\iota_\delta : \mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) \longrightarrow GL(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.2.27}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \quad \xi \quad &\in \mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) : \phi^I \xrightarrow{\xi} \phi^{I\prime} \\ \exists \quad \iota_\delta(\xi) \quad &= \begin{pmatrix} A_\xi & B_\xi \\ C_\xi & D_\xi \end{pmatrix} \in GL(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.28}$$

(In the sequel the suffix ξ will be omitted when no confusion can arise and be reinstalled when necessary for clarity.)

Using such a homomorphism we can define the simultaneous action of ξ on all the fields of our theory by setting

$$\xi : \begin{cases} \phi \longrightarrow \xi(\phi) \\ \mathbf{V} \longrightarrow \iota_\delta(\xi)\, \mathbf{V} \\ \mathcal{N}(\phi) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}'(\xi(\phi)) \end{cases} \tag{3.2.29}$$

where the notation (3.2.18) has been utilized. In the gauge sector the transformed Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}'_{vec} = \mathrm{i} \left[\mathcal{F}^{-T} (A + B\overline{\mathcal{N}})^T \overline{\mathcal{N}}' (A + B\overline{\mathcal{N}}) \mathcal{F}^- - \mathcal{F}^{+T} (A + B\mathcal{N})^T \mathcal{N}' (A + B\mathcal{N}) \mathcal{F}^+ \right] \tag{3.2.30}$$

Consistency with the definition of $\mathcal{G}^+$ requires that

$$\mathcal{N}' \equiv \mathcal{N}'(\xi(\phi)) = (C + D\mathcal{N}(\phi)) (A + B\mathcal{N}(\phi))^{-1} \tag{3.2.31}$$

while consistency with the definition of $\mathcal{G}^-$ imposes the transformation rule

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}' \equiv \overline{\mathcal{N}}'(\xi(\phi)) = \Big(C + D\overline{\mathcal{N}}(\phi)\Big)\Big(A + B\overline{\mathcal{N}}(\phi)\Big)^{-1} \tag{3.2.32}$$

It is from the transformation rules (3.2.31) and (3.2.32) that we derive a restriction on the form of the duality rotation matrix $\Lambda \equiv \iota_\delta(\xi)$. Indeed by requiring that the transformed matrix $\mathcal{N}'$ be again symmetric one easily finds that Λ must obey eq. (3.2.25), namely $\Lambda \in Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$. Consequently the homomorphism of eq. (3.2.27) specializes as

$$\iota_\delta : \mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) \longrightarrow Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.2.33}$$

Clearly, since $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ is a finite dimensional Lie group, while $\mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar})$ is infinite–dimensional, the homomorphism ι_δ can never be an isomorphism. Defining the Torelli group of the scalar manifold as

$$\mathrm{Diff}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) \supset \mathrm{Tor}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) \equiv \ker \iota_\delta \tag{3.2.34}$$

we always have

$$\dim \mathrm{Tor}\,(\mathcal{M}_{scalar}) = \infty \tag{3.2.35}$$

The reason why we have given the name of Torelli to the group defined by eq. (3.2.34) is because of its similarity with the Torelli group that occurs in algebraic geometry.

What should be clear from the above discussion is that a family of Lagrangians as in eq. (3.2.5) will admit a group of duality–rotations/field–redefinitions that will map elements of the family into each other, as long as a *kinetic matrix* $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ can be constructed that transforms as in eq. (3.2.31). A way to obtain such an object is to identify it with the *period matrix* occurring in problems of algebraic geometry. At the level of the present discussion, however, this identification is by no means essential: any construction of $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ with the appropriate transformation properties is acceptable. Note also that so far we have used the words *duality–rotations/field–redefinitions* and not the word duality symmetry. Indeed the diffeomorphisms of the scalar manifold we have considered were quite general and, as such had no pretension to be symmetries of the action, or of the theory. Indeed the question we have answered is the following: what are the appropriate transformation properties of the tensor gauge fields and of the generalized coupling constants under diffeomorphisms of the scalar manifold? The next question is obviously that of duality symmetries.

As it is the case with the difference between general covariance and isometries in the context of general relativity, duality symmetries correspond to the subset of duality transformations for which we obtain an invariance in form of the theory. In this respect, however, we have to stress that what is invariant in form cannot be the Lagrangian but only the set of field equations plus Bianchi identities. Indeed, while any $\Lambda \in Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ can, in principle, be an invariance in form of eqs. (3.2.17), the same is not true for the Lagrangian. One can easily find that the vector kinetic part of this latter transforms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{F}^{-\Lambda}\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathcal{F}^{-\Sigma} \;\rightarrow\; & \mathrm{Im}\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{-\Lambda}\,\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}^-_\Sigma \\ & = \mathrm{Im}\Big(\mathcal{F}^{-\Lambda}\mathcal{G}^-_\Lambda + 2\mathcal{F}^{-\Lambda}\,(C^TB)_\Lambda{}^\Sigma\,\mathcal{G}^-_\Sigma \\ & + \mathcal{F}^{-\Lambda}\,(C^TA)_{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathcal{F}^{-\Sigma} + \mathcal{G}^-_\Lambda\,(D^TB)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\mathcal{G}^-_\Sigma\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.36}$$

whence we conclude that proper symmetries of the Lagrangian are to be looked for only among matrices with $C = B = 0$. If $C \neq 0$ and $B = 0$, the Lagrangian varies through the addition of a topological density. Elements of $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ with $B \neq 0$, cannot be symmetries of the classical action under any circumstance.

The scalar part of the Lagrangian, on the other hand, is invariant under all those diffeomorphisms of the scalar manifolds that are *isometries* of the scalar metric g_{IJ}. Naming $\xi^\star : T\mathcal{M}_{scalar} \to T\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ the push–forward of ξ, this means that

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall\, X, Y \in T\mathcal{M}_{scalar} \\ &g(X,Y) = g(\xi^\star X, \xi^\star Y) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.37}$$

and ξ is an exact global symmetry of the scalar part of the Lagrangian in eq. (3.2.5). In view of our previous discussion these symmetries of the scalar sector are not guaranteed to admit an extension to symmetries of the complete action. Yet we can insist that they extend to symmetries of the field equations plus Bianchi identities, namely to duality symmetries in the sense defined above. This requires that the group of isometries of the scalar metric $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{M}_{scalar})$ be suitably embedded into the duality group $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ and that the kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ satisfies the covariance law:

$$\mathcal{N}(\xi(\phi)) = (C_\xi + D_\xi \mathcal{N}(\phi))(A_\xi + B_\xi \mathcal{N}(\phi))^{-1} \ . \tag{3.2.38}$$

3.3 Symplectic embeddings of homogenous spaces

A general construction of the kinetic coupling matrix $\mathcal{N}$ can be derived in the case where the scalar manifold is taken to be a homogeneous space $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. This is what happens in all extended supergravities for $N \geq 3$ and also in specific instances of N=2 theories. For this reason we shortly review the construction of the *kinetic period matrix* $\mathcal{N}$ in the case of homogeneous spaces.

The relevant homomorphism ι_δ (see eq. (3.2.33)) becomes:

$$\iota_\delta : \mathrm{Diff}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}\right) \longrightarrow Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.3.1}$$

In particular, focusing on the isometry group of the canonical metric defined on $\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}$[2]: $\mathcal{I}\left(\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}\right) = \mathcal{G}$ we must consider the embedding:

$$\iota_\delta : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \tag{3.3.2}$$

That in eq. (3.3.1) is a homomorphism of finite dimensional Lie groups and as such it constitutes a problem that can be solved in explicit form. What we just need to know is the dimension of the symplectic group, namely the number $\overline{n}$ of gauge fields appearing in the theory. Without supersymmetry the dimension m of the scalar manifold (namely the possible choices of $\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}$) and the number of vectors $\overline{n}$ are unrelated so that the possibilities covered by eq. (3.3.2) are infinitely many. In supersymmetric theories, instead, the two numbers m and $\overline{n}$ are related, so

[2]Actually, in order to be true, the equation $\mathcal{I}(\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}) = \mathcal{G}$ requires that that the normaliser of $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathcal{G}$ be the identity group, a condition that is verified in all the relevant examples

that there are finitely many cases to be studied corresponding to the possible embeddings of given groups $\mathcal{G}$ into a symplectic group $Sp(2\overline{n},\mathbb{R})$ of fixed dimension $\overline{n}$. Actually taking into account further conditions on the holonomy of the scalar manifold that are also imposed by supersymmetry, the solution for the symplectic embedding problem is unique for all extended supergravities with $N \geq 3$ (see for instance [16]).

Apart from the details of the specific case considered once a symplectic embedding is given there is a general formula one can write down for the *period matrix* $\mathcal{N}$ that guarantees symmetry ($\mathcal{N}^T = \mathcal{N}$) and the required transformation property (3.2.38). This is the result we want to review.

The real symplectic group $Sp(2\overline{n},\mathbb{R})$ is defined as the set of all *real* $2\overline{n} \times 2\overline{n}$ matrices $\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ satisfying equation (3.2.25), namely

$$\Lambda^T \mathbb{C}\, \Lambda = \mathbb{C} \tag{3.3.3}$$

where $\mathbb{C} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{1} \\ -\mathbb{1} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}$ If we relax the condition that the matrix should be real but we still impose eq. (3.3.3) we obtain the definition of the complex symplectic group $Sp(2\overline{n},\mathbb{C})$. It is a well known fact that the following isomorphism is true:

$$Sp(2\overline{n},\mathbb{R}) \sim Usp(\overline{n},\overline{n}) \equiv Sp(2\overline{n},\mathbb{C}) \cap U(\overline{n},\overline{n}) \tag{3.3.4}$$

By definition an element $\mathcal{S} \in Usp(\overline{n},\overline{n})$ is a complex matrix that satisfies simultaneously eq. (3.3.3) and a pseudo–unitarity condition, that is:

$$\mathcal{S}^T \mathbb{C}\, \mathcal{S} = \mathbb{C} \qquad ; \qquad \mathcal{S}^\dagger \mathbb{H}\, \mathcal{S} = \mathbb{H} \tag{3.3.5}$$

where $\mathbb{H} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$. The general block form of the matrix $\mathcal{S}$ is:

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{pmatrix} T & V^\star \\ V & T^\star \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.6}$$

and eq.s (3.3.5) are equivalent to:

$$T^\dagger T - V^\dagger V = \mathbb{1} \qquad ; \qquad T^\dagger V^\star - V^\dagger T^\star = \mathbf{0} \tag{3.3.7}$$

The isomorphism of eq. (3.3.4) is explicitly realized by the so called Cayley matrix:

$$\mathcal{C} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & \mathrm{i}\mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & -\mathrm{i}\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.8}$$

via the relation:

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{C}\, \Lambda\, \mathcal{C}^{-1} \tag{3.3.9}$$

which yields:

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\,(A+D) - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\,(B-C) \qquad ; \qquad V = \frac{1}{2}\,(A-D) - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\,(B+C) \tag{3.3.10}$$

When we set $V = 0$ we obtain the subgroup $U(\overline{n}) \subset Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$, that in the real basis is given by the subset of symplectic matrices of the form $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & A \end{pmatrix}$. The basic idea, to obtain the general formula for the period matrix, is that the symplectic embedding of the isometry group $\mathcal{G}$ will be such that the isotropy subgroup $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$ gets embedded into the maximal compact subgroup $U(\overline{n})$, namely:

$$\mathcal{G} \xrightarrow{\iota_\delta} Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n}) \qquad ; \qquad \mathcal{G} \supset \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{\iota_\delta} U(\overline{n}) \subset Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n}) \tag{3.3.11}$$

If this condition is realized let $L(\phi)$ be a parametrization of the coset $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ by means of coset representatives. Relying on the symplectic embedding of eq. (3.3.11) we obtain a map:

$$L(\phi) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} U_0(\phi) & U_1^\star(\phi) \\ U_1(\phi) & U_0^\star(\phi) \end{pmatrix} \in Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n}) \tag{3.3.12}$$

that associates to $L(\phi)$ a coset representative of $Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})/U(\overline{n})$. By construction if $\phi' \neq \phi$ *no* unitary $\overline{n} \times \overline{n}$ matrix W *can exist* such that:

$$\mathcal{O}(\phi') = \mathcal{O}(\phi) \begin{pmatrix} W & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & W^\star \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.13}$$

On the other hand let $\xi \in \mathcal{G}$ be an element of the isometry group of $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. Via the symplectic embedding of eq. (3.3.11) we obtain a $Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$ matrix

$$\mathcal{S}_\xi = \begin{pmatrix} T_\xi & V_\xi^\star \\ V_\xi & T_\xi^\star \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.14}$$

such that

$$\mathcal{S}_\xi \, \mathcal{O}(\phi) = \mathcal{O}(\xi(\phi)) \begin{pmatrix} W(\xi, \phi) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & W^\star(\xi, \phi) \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.15}$$

where $\xi(\phi)$ denotes the image of the point $\phi \in \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ through ξ and $W(\xi, \phi)$ is a suitable $U(\overline{n})$ compensator depending both on ξ and ϕ. Combining eq.s (3.3.15), (3.3.12), with eq.s (3.3.10) we immediately obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} U_0^\dagger(\xi(\phi)) + U_1^\dagger(\xi(\phi)) &= W \left[U_0^\dagger(\phi) \left(A^T + \mathrm{i} B^T \right) + U_1^\dagger(\phi) \left(A^T - \mathrm{i} B^T \right) \right] \\ U_0^\dagger(\xi(\phi)) - U_1^\dagger(\xi(\phi)) &= W \left[U_0^\dagger(\phi) \left(D^T - \mathrm{i} C^T \right) - U_1^\dagger(\phi) \left(D^T + \mathrm{i} C^T \right) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.3.16}$$

Setting:

$$\mathcal{N} \equiv \mathrm{i} \left[U_0^\dagger + U_1^\dagger \right]^{-1} \left[U_0^\dagger - U_1^\dagger \right] \tag{3.3.17}$$

and using the result of eq. (3.3.16) one checks that the transformation rule (3.2.38) is verified. It is also an immediate consequence of the analogue of eq.s (3.3.7) satisfied by U_0 and U_1 that the matrix in eq. (3.3.17) is symmetric

$$\mathcal{N}^T = \mathcal{N} \tag{3.3.18}$$

Eq. (3.3.17) is the master formula derived in 1981 by Gaillard and Zumino [25]. It explains the structure of the gauge field kinetic terms in all $N \geq 3$ extended supergravity theories where

the scalar manifold is always a homogeneous coset manifold. (See table 3.1). In these cases the bosonic lagrangian (3.1.21) is completely fixed from the information provided by table 3.1. The choice of the coset scalar manifold suffices to determine the scalar kinetic term, while the choice of the symplectic embedding plus the use of the master formula (3.3.17) determines the period matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$. In the case of $N = 2$ supergravity the scalar manifold is not necessarily a coset manifold. The requirement imposed by supersymmetry is that:

$$\mathcal{M}_{scalar} = \text{Special Kähler manifold}\, \mathcal{SM} \tag{3.3.19}$$

and for this class of manifolds there exists another formula that determines the *period matrix* $\mathcal{N}$. In the next section we shall discuss Special Kähler Geometry and derive such a formula. In the class of special Kähler manifolds there is a subclass that is composed of homogeneous cosets $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. For this subclass the construction of the period matrix through the relations of special geometry and the construction through the Gaillard–Zumino master formula (3.3.17) coincide.

In the next subsection we pause to illustrate the master formula (3.3.17) with an example that is of particular relevance in all superstring related supergravities.

3.3.1 Symplectic embedding of the $\mathcal{ST}\,[m,n]$ homogeneous manifolds

Because of their relevance in superstring compactifications let us illustrate the general procedure with the following class of homogeneous manifolds:

$$\mathcal{ST}\,[m,n] \equiv \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SO(m,n)}{SO(m)\otimes SO(n)} \tag{3.3.20}$$

The isometry group of the $\mathcal{ST}\,[m,n]$ manifolds defined in eq. (3.3.20) contains a factor $(SU(1,1))$ whose transformations act as non–perturbative S–dualities and another factor $(SO(m,n))$ whose transformations act as T–dualities, holding true at each order in string perturbation theory. The field S is obtained by combining together the *dilaton* D and the *axion* $\mathcal{A}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \mathcal{A} - \mathrm{i}\exp[D] \\ \partial^\mu \mathcal{A} &\equiv \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\, \partial_\nu\, B_{\rho\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{3.3.21}$$

while t^i is the name usually given to the moduli–fields of the compactified target space. Now in string and supergravity applications S will be identified with the complex coordinate on the manifold $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$, while t^i will be the coordinates of the coset space $\frac{SO(m,n)}{SO(m)\otimes SO(n)}$. The case $\mathcal{ST}[6,n]$ is the scalar manifold in $N = 4$ supergravity, while the case $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$ is a very interesting instance of special Kähler manifold appearing in superstring compactifications. Although as differentiable and metric manifolds the spaces $\mathcal{ST}\,[m,n]$ are just direct products of two factors (corresponding to the above mentioned different physical interpretation of the coordinates S and t^i), from the point of view of the symplectic embedding and duality rotations they have to be regarded as a single entity. This is even more evident in the case $m = 2, n =$ arbitrary, where the following theorem has been proven by Ferrara and Van Proeyen [28]: $\mathcal{ST}\,[2,n]$ are the only special Kähler manifolds with a direct product structure. The definition of special Kähler manifolds is given in the next section, yet the anticipation of this result should make clear that the special Kähler structure (encoding the duality rotations in the $N = 2$ case) is not

a property of the individual factors but of the product as a whole. Neither factor is by itself a special manifold although the product is.

At this point comes the question of the correct symplectic embedding. Such a question has two aspects:

1. Intrinsically inequivalent embeddings
2. Symplectically equivalent embeddings that become inequivalent after gauging

The first issue in the above list is group–theoretical in nature. When we say that the group $\mathcal{G}$ is embedded into $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ we must specify how this is done from the point of view of irreducible representations. Group–theoretically the matter is settled by specifying how the fundamental representation of $Sp(2\overline{n})$ splits into irreducible representations of $\mathcal{G}$:

$$\mathbf{2\overline{n}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \oplus_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{D}_i \tag{3.3.22}$$

Once eq. (3.3.22) is given (in supersymmetric theories such information is provided by supersymmetry) the only arbitrariness which is left is that of conjugation by arbitrary $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ matrices. Suppose we have determined an embedding ι_δ that obeys the law in eq. (3.3.22), then:

$$\forall \mathcal{S} \in Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) : \iota'_\delta \equiv \mathcal{S} \circ \iota_\delta \circ \mathcal{S}^{-1} \tag{3.3.23}$$

will obey the same law. That in eq. (3.3.23) is a symplectic transformation that corresponds to an allowed duality–rotation/field–redefinition in the abelian theory of type in eq. (3.2.5) discussed in the previous subsection. Therefore all abelian Lagrangians related by such transformations are physically equivalent.

The matter changes in presence of *gauging*. When we switch on the gauge coupling constant and the electric charges, symplectic transformations cease to yield physically equivalent theories. This is the second issue in the above list. The choice of a symplectic gauge becomes physically significant. The construction of supergravity theories proceeds in two steps. In the first step, one constructs the abelian theory: at that level the only relevant constraint is that encoded in eq. (3.3.22) and the choice of a symplectic gauge is immaterial. Actually one can write the entire theory in such a way that *symplectic covariance* is manifest. In the second step one *gauges* the theory. This *breaks symplectic covariance* and the choice of the correct symplectic gauge becomes a physical issue. This issue has been recently emphasized by the results in [29] where it has been shown that whether N=2 supersymmetry can be spontaneously broken to N=1 or not depends on the symplectic gauge.

In the applications of supergravity to the issue of BPS black–holes what matters is the *abelian ungauged theory*, so we will not further emphasize the aspects of the theory related to the gauging.

These facts being cleared we proceed to discuss the symplectic embedding of the $\mathcal{ST}[m, n]$ manifolds.

Let η be the symmetric flat metric with signature (m, n) that defines the $SO(m, n)$ group, via the relation

$$L \in SO(m, n) \Longleftrightarrow L^T \eta L = \eta \tag{3.3.24}$$

Both in the $N = 4$ and in the $N = 2$ theory, the number of gauge fields in the theory is given by:

$$\#\text{vector fields} = m \oplus n \tag{3.3.25}$$

m being the number of *graviphotons* and n the number of *vector multiplets*. Hence we have to embed $SO(m,n)$ into $Sp(2m+2n,\mathbb{R})$ and the explicit form of the decomposition in eq. (3.3.22) required by supersymmetry is:

$$\mathbf{2m}+\mathbf{2n}\overset{SO(m,n)}{\longrightarrow}\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n}\oplus\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n} \tag{3.3.26}$$

where $\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{n}$ denotes the fundamental representation of $SO(m,n)$. Eq. (3.3.26) is easily understood in physical terms. $SO(m,n)$ must be a T–duality group, namely a symmetry holding true order by order in perturbation theory. As such it must rotate electric field strengths into electric field strengths and magnetic field strengths into magnetic field field strengths. The two irreducible representations into which the fundamental representation of the symplectic group decomposes when reduced to $SO(m,n)$ correspond precisely to electric and magnetic sectors, respectively. In the *simplest gauge* the symplectic embedding satisfying eq. (3.3.26) is block–diagonal and takes the form:

$$\forall\, L\,\in\, SO(m,n)\quad\overset{\iota_\delta}{\hookrightarrow}\quad\begin{pmatrix}L & \mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0} & (L^T)^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, Sp(2m+2n,\mathbb{R}) \tag{3.3.27}$$

Consider instead the group $SU(1,1)\sim SL(2,\mathbb{R})$. This is the factor in the isometry group of $\mathcal{ST}[m,n]$ that is going to act by means of S–duality non perturbative rotations. Typically it will rotate each electric field strength into its homologous magnetic one. Correspondingly supersymmetry implies that its embedding into the symplectic group must satisfy the following condition:

$$\mathbf{2m}+\mathbf{2n}\overset{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{\longrightarrow}\oplus_{i=1}^{m+n}\,\mathbf{2} \tag{3.3.28}$$

where $\mathbf{2}$ denotes the fundamental representation of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$. In addition it must commute with the embedding of $SO(m,n)$ in eq. (3.3.27) . Both conditions are fulfilled by setting:

$$\forall\begin{pmatrix}a & b\\ c & d\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, SL(2,\mathbb{R})\quad\overset{\iota_\delta}{\hookrightarrow}\quad\begin{pmatrix}a\,\mathbb{1} & b\,\eta\\ c\,\eta & d\,\mathbb{1}\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, Sp(2m+2n,\mathbb{R}) \tag{3.3.29}$$

Utilizing eq.s (3.3.9) the corresponding embeddings into the group $Usp(m+n,m+n)$ are immediately derived:

$$\begin{aligned}\forall\, L\,\in\, SO(m,n)\quad&\overset{\iota_\delta}{\hookrightarrow}\quad\begin{pmatrix}\frac{1}{2}\,(L+\eta L\eta) & \frac{1}{2}\,(L-\eta L\eta)\\ \frac{1}{2}\,(L-\eta L\eta) & \frac{1}{2}\,(L+\eta L\eta)\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, Usp(m+n,m+n)\\ \forall\begin{pmatrix}t & v^\star\\ v & t^\star\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, SU(1,1)\quad&\overset{\iota_\delta}{\hookrightarrow}\quad\begin{pmatrix}\mathrm{Re}t\mathbb{1}+\mathrm{iIm}t\eta & \mathrm{Re}v\mathbb{1}-\mathrm{iIm}v\eta\\ \mathrm{Re}v\mathbb{1}+\mathrm{iIm}v\eta & \mathrm{Re}t\mathbb{1}-\mathrm{iIm}t\eta\end{pmatrix}\,\in\, Usp(m+n,m+n)\end{aligned} \tag{3.3.30}$$

where the relation between the entries of the $SU(1,1)$ matrix and those of the corresponding $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ matrix are provided by the relation in eq. (3.3.10).

Equipped with these relations we can proceed to derive the explicit form of the *period matrix* $\mathcal{N}$.

The homogeneous manifold $SU(1,1)/U(1)$ can be conveniently parametrized in terms of a single complex coordinate S, whose physical interpretation will be that of *axion–dilaton*,

according to eq. (3.3.21). The coset parametrization appropriate for comparison with other constructions (special geometry or $N = 4$ supergravity) is given by the family of matrices:

$$M(S) \equiv \frac{1}{n(S)} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & \frac{\mathrm{i}-S}{\mathrm{i}+S} \\ \frac{\mathrm{i}+\overline{S}}{\mathrm{i}-S} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \qquad : \qquad n(S) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{4\mathrm{Im}S}{1+|S|^2+2\mathrm{Im}S}} \tag{3.3.31}$$

To parametrize the coset $SO(m,n)/SO(m) \times SO(n)$ we can instead take the usual coset representatives (see for instance [16]):

$$L(X) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \left(\mathbb{1} + XX^T\right)^{1/2} & X \\ X^T & \left(\mathbb{1} + X^T X\right)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3.32}$$

where the $m \times n$ real matrix X provides a set of independent coordinates. Inserting these matrices into the embedding formulae of eq.s (3.3.30) we obtain a matrix:

$$\iota_\delta\left(M(S)\right) \circ \iota_\delta\left(L(X)\right) = \begin{pmatrix} U_0(S,X) & U_1^\star(S,X) \\ U_1(S,X) & U_0^\star(S,X) \end{pmatrix} \in Usp(n+m, n+m) \tag{3.3.33}$$

that inserted into the master formula of eq. (3.3.17) yields the following result:

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{i}\mathrm{Im}S\, \eta L(X) L^T(X) \eta + \mathrm{Re}S\, \eta \tag{3.3.34}$$

Alternatively, remarking that if $L(X)$ is an $SO(m,n)$ matrix also $L(X)' = \eta L(X) \eta$ is such a matrix and represents the same equivalence class, we can rewrite (3.3.34) in the simpler form:

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{i}\mathrm{Im}S\, L(X)' L^{T\prime}(X) + \mathrm{Re}S\, \eta \tag{3.3.35}$$

3.4 Special Kähler Geometry

As already stressed, in the case of $N = 2$ supergravity the requirements imposed by supersymmetry on the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ of the theory is that it should be the following direct product:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{scalar} &= \mathcal{SM} \otimes \mathcal{HM} \\ \dim_{\mathbf{C}} \mathcal{SM} &= n_v \\ \dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{HM} &= 4\, n_h \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.1}$$

where $\mathcal{SM}$, $\mathcal{HM}$ are respectively *special Kähler* and *quaternionic* and n_v, n_h are respectively the number of *vector multiplets* and *hypermultiplets* contained in the theory. The direct product structure (3.4.1) imposed by supersymmetry precisely reflects the fact that the quaternionic and special Kähler scalars belong to different supermultiplets. In the construction of BPS black–holes it turns out that the hyperscalars are spectators playing no dynamical role. Hence in this set of lectures we do not discuss the hypermultiplets any further and we confine our attention to an $N = 2$ supergravity where the graviton multiplet, containing, besides the graviton $g_{\mu\nu}$, also a graviphoton A^0_μ, is coupled to $n_v = n$ *vector multiplets*. Such a theory has an action of

type (3.1.21) where the number of gauge fields is $\overline{n} = 1 + n$ and the number of scalar fields is $m = 2\,n$. Correspondingly the indices have the following ranges

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda, \Sigma, \Gamma, \ldots &= 0, 1, \ldots, n \\ I, I, K &= 1, \ldots, 2\,n \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.2}$$

To make the action (3.1.21) fully explicit, we need to discuss the geometry of the vector multiplets scalars, namely special Kähler geometry. This is what we do in the next subsections. Let us begin by reviewing the notions of Kähler and Hodge–Kähler manifolds. The readers interested in the full-fledged structure of $N = 2$ supergravity can read [27] which contains its most general formulation and explains all the details of its construction.

3.4.1 Hodge–Kähler manifolds

Consider a *line bundle* $\mathcal{L} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{M}$ over a Kähler manifold. By definition this is a holomorphic vector bundle of rank $r = 1$. For such bundles the only available Chern class is the first:

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) \;=\; \frac{i}{2\pi}\,\overline{\partial}\,\Big(\,h^{-1}\,\partial\,h\,\Big) \;=\; \frac{i}{2\pi}\,\overline{\partial}\,\partial \log h \tag{3.4.3}$$

where the 1-component real function $h(z, \overline{z})$ is some hermitian fibre metric on $\mathcal{L}$. Let $f(z)$ be a holomorphic section of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$: noting that under the action of the operator $\overline{\partial}\,\partial$ the term $\log\Big(\overline{\xi}(\overline{z})\,\xi(z)\Big)$ yields a vanishing contribution, we conclude that the formula in eq. (3.4.3) for the first Chern class can be re-expressed as follows:

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) \;=\; \frac{i}{2\pi}\,\overline{\partial}\,\partial \log \parallel \xi(z) \parallel^2 \tag{3.4.4}$$

where $\parallel \xi(z) \parallel^2 \;=\; h(z, \overline{z})\,\overline{\xi}(\overline{z})\,\xi(z)$ denotes the norm of the holomorphic section $\xi(z)$.

Eq. (3.4.4) is the starting point for the definition of Hodge Kähler manifolds, an essential notion in supergravity theory.

A Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a Hodge manifold if and only if there exists a line bundle $\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that its first Chern class equals the cohomology class of the Kähler 2-form K:

$$c_1(\mathcal{L}) \;=\; [\,K\,] \tag{3.4.5}$$

In local terms this means that there is a holomorphic section $W(z)$ such that we can write

$$K \;=\; \frac{i}{2\pi}\,g_{ij^\star}\,dz^i \,\wedge\, d\overline{z}^{j^\star} \;=\; \frac{i}{2\pi}\,\overline{\partial}\,\partial \log \parallel W(z) \parallel^2 \tag{3.4.6}$$

Recalling the local expression of the Kähler metric in terms of the Kähler potential $g_{ij^\star} = \partial_i\,\partial_{j^\star}\mathcal{K}(z, \overline{z})$, it follows from eq.(3.4.6) that if the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a Hodge manifold, then the exponential of the Kähler potential can be interpreted as the metric $h(z, \overline{z}) = \exp\left(\mathcal{K}(z, \overline{z})\right)$ on an appropriate line bundle $\mathcal{L}$.

This structure is precisely that advocated by the Lagrangian of $N = 1$ matter coupled supergravity: the holomorphic section $W(z)$ of the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ is what, in N=1 supergravity theory, is named the superpotential and the logarithm of its norm $\log \parallel W(z) \parallel^2 = \mathcal{K}(z, \overline{z}) + \log|\,W(z)\,|^2 \;=\; G(z, \overline{z})$ is precisely the invariant function in terms of which one writes the potential and Yukawa coupling terms of the supergravity action (see [21] and for a review [16]).

3.4.2 Special Kähler Manifolds: general discussion

There are in fact two kinds of special Kähler geometry: the local and the rigid one. The former describes the scalar field sector of vector multiplets in $N = 2$ supergravity while the latter describes the same sector in rigid $N = 2$ Yang–Mills theories. Since $N = 2$ includes $N = 1$ supersymmetry, local and rigid special Kähler manifolds must be compatible with the geometric structures that are respectively enforced by local and rigid $N = 1$ supersymmetry in the scalar sector. The distinction between the two cases deals with the first Chern–class of the line–bundle $\mathcal{L} \stackrel{\pi}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{M}$, whose sections are the possible superpotentials. In the local theory $c_1(\mathcal{L}) = [K]$ and this restricts $\mathcal{M}$ to be a Hodge–Kähler manifold. In the rigid theory, instead, we have $c_1(\mathcal{L}) = 0$. At the level of the Lagrangian this reflects into a different behaviour of the fermion fields. These latter are sections of $\mathcal{L}^{1/2}$ and couple to the canonical hermitian connection defined on $\mathcal{L}$:

$$\theta \equiv h^{-1}\,\partial\, h = \tfrac{1}{h}\,\partial_i h\, dz^i \quad ; \quad \overline{\theta} \equiv h^{-1}\,\overline{\partial}\, h = \tfrac{1}{h}\,\partial_{i^\star} h\, d\overline{z}^{i^\star} \tag{3.4.7}$$

In the local case where

$$\left[\,\overline{\partial}\,\theta\,\right] = c_1(\mathcal{L}) = [K] \tag{3.4.8}$$

the fibre metric h can be identified with the exponential of the Kähler potential and we obtain:

$$\theta = \partial\,\mathcal{K} = \partial_i \mathcal{K} dz^i \quad ; \quad \overline{\theta} = \overline{\partial}\,\mathcal{K} = \partial_{i^\star}\mathcal{K} d\overline{z}^{i^\star} \tag{3.4.9}$$

In the rigid case, $\mathcal{L}$ is instead a flat bundle and its metric is unrelated to the Kähler potential. Actually one can choose a vanishing connection:

$$\theta = \overline{\theta} = 0 \tag{3.4.10}$$

The distinction between rigid and local special manifolds is the $N = 2$ generalization of this difference occurring at the $N = 1$ level.

In these lectures, since we are interested in BPS black-holes and therefore in supergravity, we discuss only the case of local special geometry, leaving aside the rigid case that is relevant for $N = 2$ gauge theories. The interested reader can find further details in [26] or in [27] which contain also all the references to the original papers on special geometry.

In the $N = 2$ case, in addition to the line–bundle $\mathcal{L}$ we need a flat holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{SV} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ whose sections can be identified with the superspace *fermi–fermi* components of electric and magnetic field–strengths. In this way, according to the discussion of previous sections the diffeomorphisms of the scalar manifolds will be lifted to produce an action on the gauge–field strengths as well. In a supersymmetric theory where scalars and gauge fields belong to the same multiplet this is a mandatory condition. However this symplectic bundle structure must be made compatible with the line–bundle structure already requested by $N = 1$ supersymmetry. This leads to the existence of two kinds of special geometry. Another essential distinction between the two kind of geometries arises from the different number of vector fields in the theory. In the rigid case this number equals that of the vector multiplets so that

$$\begin{aligned} \#\,\text{vector fields} \equiv \overline{n} &= n \\ \#\,\text{vector multiplets} \equiv n &= \dim_{\mathbf{C}} \mathcal{M} \\ \text{rank}\,\mathcal{SV} \equiv 2\overline{n} &= 2n \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.11}$$

On the other hand, in the local case, in addition to the vector fields arising from the vector multiplets we have also the graviphoton coming from the graviton multiplet. Hence we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \#\,\text{vector fields} \equiv \overline{n} &= n+1 \\ \#\,\text{vector multiplets} \equiv n &= \dim_{\mathbf{C}} \mathcal{M} \\ \text{rank}\,\mathcal{SV} \equiv 2\overline{n} &= 2n+2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.12}$$

In the sequel we make extensive use of covariant derivatives with respect to the canonical connection of the line–bundle $\mathcal{L}$. Let us review its normalization. As it is well known there exists a correspondence between line–bundles and $U(1)$–bundles. If $\exp[f_{\alpha\beta}(z)]$ is the transition function between two local trivializations of the line–bundle $\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$, the transition function in the corresponding principal $U(1)$–bundle $U \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is just $\exp[\mathrm{i}\mathrm{Im} f_{\alpha\beta}(z)]$ and the Kähler potentials in two different charts are related by:

$$\mathcal{K}_\beta = \mathcal{K}_\alpha + f_{\alpha\beta} + \overline{f}_{\alpha\beta} \tag{3.4.13}$$

At the level of connections this correspondence is formulated by setting:

$$U(1)\text{–connection} \equiv \mathcal{Q} = \mathrm{Im}\theta = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(\theta - \overline{\theta}\right) \tag{3.4.14}$$

If we apply the above formula to the case of the $U(1)$–bundle $\mathcal{U} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ associated with the line–bundle $\mathcal{L}$ whose first Chern class equals the Kähler class, we get:

$$\mathcal{Q} = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(\partial_i \mathcal{K} dz^i - \partial_{i^*}\mathcal{K} d\overline{z}^{i^*}\right) \tag{3.4.15}$$

Let now $\Phi(z,\overline{z})$ be a section of $\mathcal{U}^p$. By definition its covariant derivative is

$$\nabla\Phi = (d + ip\mathcal{Q})\Phi \tag{3.4.16}$$

or, in components,

$$\nabla_i\Phi = (\partial_i + \tfrac{1}{2}p\partial_i\mathcal{K})\Phi \quad ; \quad \nabla_{i^*}\Phi = (\partial_{i^*} - \tfrac{1}{2}p\partial_{i^*}\mathcal{K})\Phi \tag{3.4.17}$$

A covariantly holomorphic section of $\mathcal{U}$ is defined by the equation: $\nabla_{i^*}\Phi = 0$. We can easily map each section $\Phi(z,\overline{z})$ of $\mathcal{U}^p$ into a section of the line–bundle $\mathcal{L}$ by setting:

$$\widetilde{\Phi} = e^{-p\mathcal{K}/2}\Phi\,. \tag{3.4.18}$$

With this position we obtain:

$$\nabla_i\widetilde{\Phi} = (\partial_i + p\partial_i\mathcal{K})\widetilde{\Phi} \quad ; \quad \nabla_{i^*}\widetilde{\Phi} = \partial_{i^*}\widetilde{\Phi} \tag{3.4.19}$$

Under the map of eq. (3.4.18) covariantly holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{U}$ flow into holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{L}$ and viceversa.

3.4.3 Special Kähler manifolds: the local case

We are now ready to give the definition of local special Kähler manifolds and illustrate their properties. A first definition that does not make direct reference to the symplectic bundle is the following:

Definition 3.4.1 *A Hodge Kähler manifold is* **Special Kähler (of the local type)** *if there exists a completely symmetric holomorphic 3-index section W_{ijk} of $(T^\star\mathcal{M})^3 \otimes \mathcal{L}^2$ (and its antiholomorphic conjugate $W_{i^*j^*k^*}$) such that the following identity is satisfied by the Riemann tensor of the Levi–Civita connection:*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{m^*} W_{ijk} &= 0 \quad \partial_m W_{i^*j^*k^*} = 0 \\ \nabla_{[m} W_{i]jk} &= 0 \quad \nabla_{[m} W_{i^*]j^*k^*} = 0 \\ \mathcal{R}_{i^*j\ell^*k} &= g_{\ell^*j} g_{ki^*} + g_{\ell^*k} g_{ji^*} - e^{2\mathcal{K}} W_{i^*\ell^*s^*} W_{tkj} g^{s^*t} \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.20}$$

In the above equations ∇ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to both the Levi–Civita and the $U(1)$ holomorphic connection of eq. (3.4.15). In the case of W_{ijk}, the $U(1)$ weight is $p = 2$.

The holomorphic sections W_{ijk} have two different physical interpretations in the case that the special manifold is utilized as scalar manifold in an N=1 or N=2 theory. In the first case they correspond to the Yukawa couplings of Fermi families [22]. In the second case they provide the coefficients for the anomalous magnetic moments of the gauginos, since they appear in the Pauli–terms of the $N = 2$ effective action. Out of the W_{ijk} we can construct covariantly holomorphic sections of weight 2 and - 2 by setting:

$$C_{ijk} = W_{ijk}\, e^{\mathcal{K}} \quad ; \quad C_{i^\star j^\star k^\star} = W_{i^\star j^\star k^\star}\, e^{\mathcal{K}} \tag{3.4.21}$$

Next we can give the second more intrinsic definition that relies on the notion of the flat symplectic bundle. Let $\mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ denote the complex line bundle whose first Chern class equals the Kähler form K of an n-dimensional Hodge–Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{SV} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ denote a holomorphic flat vector bundle of rank $2n + 2$ with structural group $Sp(2n + 2, \mathbb{R})$. Consider tensor bundles of the type $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{SV} \otimes \mathcal{L}$. A typical holomorphic section of such a bundle will be denoted by Ω and will have the following structure:

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Sigma \end{pmatrix} \quad \Lambda, \Sigma = 0, 1, \ldots, n \tag{3.4.22}$$

By definition the transition functions between two local trivializations $U_i \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $U_j \subset \mathcal{M}$ of the bundle $\mathcal{H}$ have the following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ F \end{pmatrix}_i = e^{f_{ij}} M_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ F \end{pmatrix}_j \tag{3.4.23}$$

where f_{ij} are holomorphic maps $U_i \cap U_j \to \mathbb{C}$ while M_{ij} is a constant $Sp(2n + 2, \mathbb{R})$ matrix. For a consistent definition of the bundle the transition functions are obviously subject to the

cocycle condition on a triple overlap:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{f_{ij}+f_{jk}+f_{ki}} &= 1 \\ M_{ij}M_{jk}M_{ki} &= 1 \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.24}$$

Let $i\langle \ | \ \rangle$ be the compatible hermitian metric on $\mathcal{H}$

$$i\langle \Omega \,|\, \overline{\Omega} \rangle \equiv -i\Omega^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1} \\ -\mathbb{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \overline{\Omega} \tag{3.4.25}$$

Definition 3.4.2 *We say that a Hodge–Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is* **special Kähler of the local type** *if there exists a bundle $\mathcal{H}$ of the type described above such that for some section $\Omega \in \Gamma(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{M})$ the Kähler two form is given by:*

$$K = \frac{i}{2\pi}\partial\overline{\partial} \log \left(\mathrm{i}\langle \Omega \,|\, \overline{\Omega} \rangle \right). \tag{3.4.26}$$

From the point of view of local properties, eq. (3.4.26) implies that we have an expression for the Kähler potential in terms of the holomorphic section Ω:

$$\mathcal{K} \,=\, -\log \left(\mathrm{i}\langle \Omega \,|\, \overline{\Omega} \rangle \right) \,=\, -\log \left[\mathrm{i} \left(\overline{X}^{\Lambda} F_{\Lambda} - \overline{F}_{\Sigma} X^{\Sigma} \right) \right] \tag{3.4.27}$$

The relation between the two definitions of special manifolds is obtained by introducing a non holomorphic section of the bundle $\mathcal{H}$ according to:

$$V \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} L^{\Lambda} \\ M_{\Sigma} \end{pmatrix} \equiv e^{\mathcal{K}/2}\Omega \,=\, e^{\mathcal{K}/2} \begin{pmatrix} X^{\Lambda} \\ F_{\Sigma} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.28}$$

so that eq. (3.4.27) becomes:

$$1 \,=\, \mathrm{i}\langle V \,|\, \overline{V} \rangle \,=\, \mathrm{i} \left(\overline{L}^{\Lambda} M_{\Lambda} - \overline{M}_{\Sigma} L^{\Sigma} \right) \tag{3.4.29}$$

Since V is related to a holomorphic section by eq. (3.4.28) it immediately follows that:

$$\nabla_{i^\star} V \,=\, \left(\partial_{i^\star} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_{i^\star}\mathcal{K} \right) V \,=\, 0 \tag{3.4.30}$$

On the other hand, from eq. (3.4.29), defining:

$$U_i = \nabla_i V = \left(\partial_i + \frac{1}{2}\partial_i \mathcal{K} \right) V \equiv \begin{pmatrix} f_i^{\Lambda} \\ h_{\Sigma|i} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.31}$$

it follows that:

$$\nabla_i U_j = \mathrm{i} C_{ijk}\, g^{k\ell^\star}\, \overline{U}_{\ell^\star} \tag{3.4.32}$$

where ∇_i denotes the covariant derivative containing both the Levi–Civita connection on the bundle $\mathcal{TM}$ and the canonical connection θ on the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$. In eq. (3.4.32) the symbol C_{ijk} denotes a covariantly holomorphic ($\nabla_{\ell^\star} C_{ijk} = 0$) section of the bundle $\mathcal{TM}^3 \otimes \mathcal{L}^2$ that

is totally symmetric in its indices. This tensor can be identified with the tensor of eq. (3.4.21) appearing in eq. (3.4.20). Alternatively, the set of differential equations:

$$\nabla_i V = U_i \tag{3.4.33}$$
$$\nabla_i U_j = \mathrm{i} C_{ijk} g^{k\ell^\star} U_{\ell^\star} \tag{3.4.34}$$
$$\nabla_{i^\star} U_j = g_{i^\star j} V \tag{3.4.35}$$
$$\nabla_{i^\star} V = 0 \tag{3.4.36}$$

with V satisfying eq.s (3.4.28), (3.4.29) give yet another definition of special geometry. This is actually what one obtains from the $N = 2$ solution of superspace Bianchi identities. In particular it is easy to find eq. (3.4.20) as integrability conditions of (3.4.36) The *period matrix* is now introduced via the relations:

$$\overline{M}_\Lambda = \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\overline{L}^\Sigma \quad ; \quad h_{\Sigma|i} = \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma} f_i^\Sigma \tag{3.4.37}$$

which can be solved introducing the two $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ vectors

$$f_I^\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} f_i^\Lambda \\ \overline{L}^\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad h_{\Lambda|I} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{\Lambda|i} \\ \overline{M}_\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.38}$$

and setting:

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma} = h_{\Lambda|I} \circ \left(f^{-1}\right)^I{}_\Sigma \tag{3.4.39}$$

As a consequence of its definition the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ transforms, under diffeomorphisms of the base Kähler manifold exactly as it is requested by the rule in eq. (3.2.38). Indeed this is the very reason why the structure of special geometry has been introduced. The existence of the symplectic bundle $\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is required in order to be able to pull–back the action of the diffeomorphisms on the field strengths and to construct the kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}$.

From the previous formulae it is easy to derive a set of useful relations among which we quote the following [23]:

$$\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} L^\Lambda \overline{L}^\Sigma = -\frac{1}{2} \tag{3.4.40}$$
$$\langle V, U_i \rangle = \langle V, U_{i^\star} \rangle = 0 \tag{3.4.41}$$
$$U^{\Lambda\Sigma} \equiv f_i^\Lambda f_{j^\star}^\Sigma g^{ij^\star} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}\right)^{-1|\Lambda\Sigma} - \overline{L}^\Lambda L^\Sigma \tag{3.4.42}$$
$$g_{ij^\star} = -\mathrm{i} \langle U_i \,|\, \overline{U}_{j^\star} \rangle = -2 f_i^\Lambda \mathrm{Im}\, \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} f_{j^\star}^\Sigma \; ; \tag{3.4.43}$$
$$C_{ijk} = \langle \nabla_i U_j \,|\, U_k \rangle = f_i^\Lambda \partial_j \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma} f_k^\Sigma = (\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma} f_i^\Lambda \partial_j f_k^\Sigma \tag{3.4.44}$$

In particular eq.s (3.4.44) express the Kähler metric and the anomalous magnetic moments in terms of symplectic invariants. It is clear from our discussion that nowhere we have assumed the base Kähler manifold to be a homogeneous space. So, in general, special manifolds are not homogeneous spaces. Yet there is a subclass of homogenous special manifolds. The homogeneous symmetric ones were classified by Cremmer and Van Proeyen in [24] and are displayed in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: *Homogeneous Symmetric Special Manifolds*

n	G/H	$Sp(2n+2)$	symp rep of G
1	$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$	$Sp(4)$	$\underline{\mathbf{4}}$
n	$\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\times U(1)}$	$Sp(2n+2)$	$\underline{\mathbf{n+1}} \oplus \underline{\mathbf{n+1}}$
$n+1$	$\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SO(2,n)}{SO(2)\times SO(n)}$	$Sp(2n+4)$	$\underline{\mathbf{2}} \otimes (\underline{\mathbf{n+2}} \oplus \underline{\mathbf{n+2}})$
6	$\frac{Sp(6,\mathbb{R})}{SU(3)\times U(1)}$	$Sp(14)$	$\underline{\mathbf{14}}$
9	$\frac{SU(3,3)}{S(U(3)\times U(3))}$	$Sp(20)$	$\underline{\mathbf{20}}$
15	$\frac{SO^\star(12)}{SU(6)\times U(1)}$	$Sp(32)$	$\underline{\mathbf{32}}$
27	$\frac{E_{7(-6)}}{E_6\times SO(2)}$	$Sp(56)$	$\underline{\mathbf{56}}$

It goes without saying that for homogeneous special manifolds the two constructions of the period matrix, that provided by the master formula in eq. (3.3.17) and that given by eq. (3.4.39) must agree. In subsection 3.4.5 we verify it in the case of the manifolds $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$ that correspond to the second infinite family of homogeneous special manifolds displayed in table 3.2.

Anyhow, since special geometry guarantees the existence of a kinetic period matrix with the correct covariance property it is evident that to each special manifold we can associate a duality covariant bosonic Lagrangian of the type considered in eq. (3.2.5). However special geometry contains more structures than just the period matrix $\mathcal{N}$ and the scalar metric $g_{ij^\star}$. All the other items of the construction do have a place and play an essential role in the supergravity Lagrangian and the supersymmetry transformation rules. We shall have to manipulate them also in discussing the BPS black–holes.

3.4.4 Special Kähler manifolds: the issue of special coordinates

So far no privileged coordinate system has been chosen on the base Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and no mention has been made of the holomorphic prepotential $F(X)$ that is ubiquitous in the $N=2$ literature. The simultaneous avoidance of privileged coordinates and of the prepotential is not accidental. Indeed, when the definition of special Kähler manifolds is given in intrinsic terms, as we did in the previous subsection, the holomorphic prepotential $F(X)$ can be dispensed of. Whether a prepotential $F(X)$ exists or not depends on the choice of a symplectic gauge which is immaterial in the abelian theory but not in the gauged one. Actually, in the local case, it appears that some physically interesting cases are precisely instances where $F(X)$ does not exist. On the contrary the prepotential $F(X)$ seems to be a necessary ingredient in the tensor calculus constructions of $N=2$ theories that for this reason are not completely general. This happens because tensor calculus uses special coordinates from the very start. Let us then see how the notion of $F(X)$ emerges if we resort to special coordinate systems.

Note that under a Kähler transformation $\mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{K} + f(z) + \overline{f}(\overline{z})$ the holomorphic section transforms, in the local case, as $\Omega \to \Omega\, e^{-f}$, so that we have $X^\Lambda \to X^\Lambda\, e^{-f}$. This means that, at least locally, the upper half of Ω (associated with the electric field strengths) can be regarded as a set X^Λ of homogeneous coordinates on $\mathcal{M}$, provided that the jacobian matrix

$$e_i^I(z) = \partial_i \left(\frac{X^I}{X^0} \right) \quad ; \quad a = 1, \ldots, n \tag{3.4.45}$$

is invertible. In this case, for the lower part of the symplectic section Ω we obtain $F_\Lambda = F_\Lambda(X)$. Recalling eq.s (3.4.41), in particular:

$$0 \,=\, \langle\, V \,|\, U_i \,\rangle \,=\, X^\Lambda\, \partial_i F_\Lambda - \partial_i X^\Lambda\, F_\Lambda \tag{3.4.46}$$

we obtain:

$$X^\Sigma\, \partial_\Sigma F_\Lambda(x) \,=\, F_\Lambda(X) \tag{3.4.47}$$

so that we can conclude:

$$F_\Lambda(X) \,=\, \frac{\partial}{\partial X^\Lambda} F(X) \tag{3.4.48}$$

where $F(X)$ is a homogeneous function of degree 2 of the homogeneous coordinates X^Λ. Therefore,when the determinant of the Jacobian (3.4.45) is non vanishing, we can use the *special*

coordinates:

$$t^I \equiv \frac{X^I}{X^0} \tag{3.4.49}$$

and the whole geometric structure can be derived by a single holomorphic prepotential:

$$\mathcal{F}(t) \equiv (X^0)^{-2} F(X) \tag{3.4.50}$$

In particular, eq.(3.4.27) for the Kähler potential becomes

$$\mathcal{K}(t,\bar{t}) = -\log \mathrm{i}\Big[2\left(\mathcal{F}-\overline{\mathcal{F}}\right) - \left(\partial_I \mathcal{F} + \partial_{I^\star}\overline{\mathcal{F}}\right)\left(t^I - \bar{t}^{I^\star}\right)\Big] \tag{3.4.51}$$

while eq.(3.4.44) for the magnetic moments simplifies into

$$W_{IJK} = \partial_I \partial_J \partial_K \mathcal{F}(t) \tag{3.4.52}$$

Finally we note that in the rigid case the Jacobian from a generic parametrization to special coordinates

$$e_i^I(z) = \partial_i \left(\frac{X^I}{X^0}\right) = A + B\overline{\mathcal{N}} \tag{3.4.53}$$

cannot have zero eigenvalues, and therefore the function F always exist. In this case the matrix $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ coincides with $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial X^I \partial X^J}$.

3.4.5 The special geometry of the $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$ manifolds

When we studied the symplectic embeddings of the $\mathcal{ST}[m,n]$ manifolds, defined by eq.(3.3.20), a study that lead us to the general formula in eq.(3.3.35), we remarked that the subclass $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$ constitutes a family of special Kähler manifolds: actually a quite relevant one. Here we survey the special geometry of this class.

Consider a standard parametrization of the $SO(2,n)/SO(2)\times SO(n)$ manifold, like for instance that in eq.(3.3.32). In the $m=2$ case we can introduce a canonical complex structure on the manifold by setting:

$$\Phi^\Lambda(X) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(L^\Lambda{}_0 + \mathrm{i}\, L^\Lambda{}_1\right) \qquad ; \qquad (\Lambda = 0,1,a \quad a=2,\ldots,n+1) \tag{3.4.54}$$

The relations satisfied by the upper two rows of the coset representative (consequence of $L(X)$ being pseudo–orthogonal with respect to metric $\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = \mathrm{diag}(+,+,-,\ldots,-)$):

$$L^\Lambda{}_0\, L^\Sigma{}_0\, \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = 1 \quad ; \quad L^\Lambda{}_0\, L^\Sigma{}_1\, \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = 0 \quad ; \quad L^\Lambda{}_1\, L^\Sigma{}_1\, \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = 1 \tag{3.4.55}$$

can be summarized into the complex equations:

$$\overline{\Phi}^\Lambda\, \Phi^\Sigma \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = 1 \quad ; \quad \Phi^\Sigma \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} = 0 \tag{3.4.56}$$

Eq.s (3.4.56) are solved by posing:

$$\Phi^\Lambda = \frac{X^\Lambda}{\sqrt{\overline{X}^\Lambda\, X^\Sigma\, \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}}} \tag{3.4.57}$$

where X^Λ denotes any set of complex parameters, determined up to an overall multiplicative constant and satisfying the constraint:

$$X^\Lambda\, X^\Sigma \eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} \,=\, 0 \tag{3.4.58}$$

In this way we have proved the identification, as differentiable manifolds, of the coset space G/H where $G = SO(2,n)$ and $H = SO(2) \times SO(n)$ with the vanishing locus of the quadric in eq.(3.4.58). Taking any holomorphic solution of eq.(3.4.58), for instance:

$$X^\Lambda(y) \,\equiv\, \begin{pmatrix} 1/2\,(1+y^2) \\ \mathrm{i}/2\,(1-y^2) \\ y^a \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.59}$$

where y^a is a set of n independent complex coordinates, inserting it into eq.(3.4.57) and comparing with eq.(3.4.54) we obtain the relation between whatever coordinates we had previously used to write the coset representative $L(X)$ and the complex coordinates y^a. In other words we can regard the matrix L as a function of the y^a that are named the Calabi Visentini coordinates [31].

Consider in addition the *axion–dilaton* field S that parametrizes the $SU(1,1)/U(1)$ coset according with eq.(3.3.31). The special geometry of the manifold $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$ is completely specified by writing the holomorphic symplectic section Ω as follows ([32]):

$$\Omega(y,S) \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ F_\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda(y) \\ \mathcal{S}\,\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma} X^\Sigma(y) \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.60}$$

Notice that with the above choice, it is not possible to describe F_Λ as derivatives of any prepotential. Yet everything else can be calculated utilizing the formulae we presented in the text. The Kähler potential is:

$$\mathcal{K} \,=\, \mathcal{K}_1(S) + \mathcal{K}_2(y) \,=\, -\log\left[\mathrm{i}\,(\overline{S}-S)\right] - \log X^T \eta X \tag{3.4.61}$$

The Kähler metric is block diagonal:

$$g_{ij^\star} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} g_{S\overline{S}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & g_{a\overline{b}} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{cases} g_{S\overline{S}} = \partial_S \partial_{\overline{S}} \mathcal{K}_1 = \frac{-1}{(\overline{S}-S)^2} \\ g_{a\overline{b}}(y) = \partial_a \partial_{\overline{b}} \mathcal{K}_2 \end{cases} \tag{3.4.62}$$

as expected. The anomalous magnetic moments-Yukawa couplings C_{ijk} $(i = S, a)$ have a very simple expression in the chosen coordinates:

$$C_{Sab} = -\exp[\mathcal{K}]\,\delta_{ab}, \tag{3.4.63}$$

all the other components being zero.

Using the definition of the *period matrix* given in eq.(3.4.39) we obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} = (S-\overline{S})\frac{X_\Lambda \overline{X}_\Sigma + \overline{X}_\Lambda X_\Sigma}{\overline{X}^T \eta X} + \overline{S}\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}. \tag{3.4.64}$$

In order to see that eq.(3.4.64) just coincides with eq.(3.3.35) it suffices to note that as a consequence of its definition (3.4.54) and of the pseudo–orthogonality of the coset representative $L(X)$, the vector Φ^Λ satisfies the following identity:

$$\Phi^\Lambda \overline{\Phi}^\Sigma + \Phi^\Sigma \overline{\Phi}^\Lambda = \frac{1}{2} L^\Lambda{}_\Gamma L^\Sigma{}_\Delta \left(\delta^{\Gamma\Delta} + \eta^{\Gamma\Delta}\right) \tag{3.4.65}$$

Inserting eq.(3.4.65) into eq.(3.4.64), formula (3.3.35) is retrieved.

This completes the proof that the choice (3.4.60) of the special geometry holomorphic section corresponds to the symplectic embedding (3.3.27) and (3.3.29) of the coset manifold $\mathcal{ST}[2,n]$. In this symplectic gauge the symplectic transformations of the isometry group are the simplest possible ones and the entire group $SO(2,n)$ is represented by means of *classical* transformations that do not mix electric fields with magnetic fields. The disadvantage of this basis, if any, is that there is no holomorphic prepotential. To find an $F(X)$ it suffices to make a symplectic rotation to a different basis.

If we set:

$$\begin{aligned} X^1 = \frac{1}{2}(1+y^2) &= -\frac{1}{2}(1-\eta_{ij}t^i t^j) \\ X^2 = i\frac{1}{2}(1-y^2) &= t^2 \\ X^a = y^a &= t^{2+a} \quad a = 1,\ldots,n-1 \\ X^{a=n} = y^n &= \frac{1}{2}(1+\eta_{ij}t^i t^j) \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.66}$$

where

$$\eta_{ij} = \mathrm{diag}\,(+,-,\ldots,-) \;\; i,j = 2,\ldots,n+1 \tag{3.4.67}$$

then we can show that $\exists\, \mathcal{C} \in Sp(2n+2,\mathbb{R})$ such that:

$$\mathcal{C}\begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda \\ S\eta_{\Lambda\Sigma}X^\Lambda \end{pmatrix} = \exp[\varphi(t)] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ S \\ t^i \\ 2\,\mathcal{F} - t^i \frac{\partial}{\partial t^i}\mathcal{F} - S\frac{\partial}{S}\mathcal{F} \\ S\frac{\partial}{S}\mathcal{F} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t^i}\mathcal{F} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.68}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(S,t) &= \frac{1}{2}\,S\,\eta_{ij}t^i t^j = \frac{1}{2}\,d_{IJK}t^I t^J t^K \\ t^1 &= S \\ d_{IJK} &= \begin{cases} d_{1jk} = \eta_{ij} \\ 0 \;\; \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{3.4.69}$$

and

$$W_{IJK} = d_{IJK} = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{F}(S,t^i)}{\partial t^I \partial t^J \partial t^K} \tag{3.4.70}$$

This means that in the new basis the symplectic holomorphic section $\mathcal{C}\Omega$ can be derived from the following cubic prepotential:

$$F(X) \,=\, \frac{1}{3!}\,\frac{d_{IJK}\,X^I\,X^J\,X^K}{X_0} \tag{3.4.71}$$

For instance in the case $n = 1$ the matrix which does such a job is:

$$\mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4.72}$$

3.5 The bosonic lagrangian and the supersymmetry transformation rules of N=2 supergravity

Using special Kähler geometry as described in the previous section we can now write both the bosonic action and the supersymmetry transformation rules of the fermions pertaining to $N = 2$ supergravity, namely the ingredients needed to write down the equations defining N=2 BPS black–holes.

In the complex notation appropriate to special geometry and using the definitions (3.2.9) the action can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{SUGRA|Bose}_{ungauged} \;&=\; \sqrt{-g}\Big[\, R[g] \,+\, g_{ij^\star}(z,\overline{z})\,\partial^\mu z^i\,\partial_\mu \overline{z}^{j^\star} \\ &\quad +\mathrm{i}\,\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathcal{F}^{-\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}^{-\Sigma|\mu\nu} \,-\, \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathcal{F}^{+\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}^{+\Sigma|\mu\nu}\right)\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{3.5.1}$$

The fermion fields of the theory are of two kinds:

1. The gravitino $\psi_{A\mu}$
2. The gaugino λ^{iA}

The gravitino $\psi_{A\mu}$ is an $SU(2)$ doublet ($A = 1, 2$) of spin 3/2 spinor–vectors. Here the group $SU(2)$ is the automorphism group of the $N = 2$ supersymmetry algebra, usually called R–symmetry. Following the conventions of [16] and [27], the position of the $SU(2)$ index, whether upper or lower, is related to the chirality projection on the fields. For the gravitino doublet we have left chirality:

$$\gamma_5\,\psi_{A\mu} = \psi_{A\mu} \tag{3.5.2}$$

The complex conjugate doublet, transforming under the conjugate representation of $SU(2)$ contains the right chirality projection of the same Majorana field:

$$\gamma_5\,\psi^A_\mu = -\psi^A_\mu \tag{3.5.3}$$

On the other hand the gauginos λ^{iA}, are $SU(2)$ doublets of spin 1/2 fields that carry also a contravariant world-index of the special Kähler manifold. In other words the gauginos, in addition to being sections of the spin–bundle on space–time are also sections of the holomorphic tangent bundle $T\mathcal{SM}$. The chirality of the gaugino with upper $SU(2)$ doublet index is left:

$$\gamma_5 \, \lambda^{iA} = \lambda^{iA} \tag{3.5.4}$$

The right chirality projection $\lambda^{i^\star}_A = -\gamma_5 \, \lambda^{i^\star}_A$ transforms under $SU(2)$ in the same way as the left-projection of the gravitino but it is a section of the antiholomorphic tangent bundle $\overline{T}\mathcal{SM}$.

Correspondingly in a purely bosonic background the supersymmetry transformation rules of the fermion fields are the following ones:

$$\delta \, \Psi_{A\mu} = \mathcal{D}_\mu \, \epsilon_A + \epsilon_{AB} \, T^-_{\mu\nu} \, \gamma^\nu \epsilon^B \tag{3.5.5}$$

$$\delta \, \lambda^{iA} = \mathrm{i} \, \nabla_\mu \, z^i \, \gamma^\mu \epsilon^A + G^{-i}_{\mu\nu} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_B \epsilon^{AB} \tag{3.5.6}$$

where the local supersymmetry parameter is also split into chirality projections transforming in the doublet or conjugate doublet representation of $SU(2)$:

$$\gamma_5 \, \epsilon_A = \epsilon_A \quad ; \quad \gamma_5 \, \epsilon^A = -\epsilon^A \tag{3.5.7}$$

and where we have defined:

$$T^-_{\mu\nu} = 2\mathrm{i} \, (\mathrm{Im} \, \mathcal{N})_{\Lambda\Sigma} \, L^\Sigma F^{\Lambda -}_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.5.8}$$

$$T^+_{\mu\nu} = 2\mathrm{i} \, (\mathrm{Im} \, \mathcal{N})_{\Lambda\Sigma} \, \overline{L}^\Sigma F^{\Lambda +}_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.5.9}$$

$$G^{i-}_{\mu\nu} = -g^{ij^\star} \overline{f}^\Gamma_{j^\star} \, (\mathrm{Im} \, \mathcal{N})_{\Gamma\Lambda} \, F^{\Lambda -}_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.5.10}$$

$$G^{i^\star +}_{\mu\nu} = -g^{i^\star j} f^\Gamma_j \, (\mathrm{Im} \, \mathcal{N})_{\Gamma\Lambda} \, F^{\Lambda +}_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.5.11}$$

The scalar field dependent combinations of fields strengths appearing in the fermion supersymmetry transformation rules that we listed above in eq.s (3.5.8)(3.5.9),(3.5.10),(3.5.11) have a profound meaning and play a key role in the physics of BPS black–holes. The combination $T^-_{\mu\nu}$ is named the graviphoton field strength and its integral over a 2–sphere at infinity gives the value of *the central charge* Z of the $N = 2$ supersymmetry algebra. The combination $G^{i-}_{\mu\nu}$ is named the matter field strength. Evaluating its integral on a 2–sphere at infinity one obtains the so called *matter charges* Z^i. These are the covariant derivatives of the central charge Z with respect to the *moduli*, namely the vector multiplet scalars z^i.

This will become clear in our general discussion of the $N = 2$ BPS black holes that we are finally in a position to address, having clarified all the necessary geometric ingredients.

3.6 $N = 2$ BPS black holes: general discussion

In this section we consider the general properties of BPS saturated black–holes in the context of $N = 2$ supergravity. As our analysis will reveal these properties are completely rooted in the special Kähler geometric structure of the mother theory. In particular the entropy of the black–hole is related to the central charge, namely to the integral of the graviphoton field strength evaluated for very special values of the scalar fields z^i. These special values, named the *fixed*

scalars z^i_{fix}, are functions solely of the electric and magnetic charges $\{q_\Sigma, p^\Lambda\}$ of the hole and are attained by the scalars $z^i(r)$ at the hole-horizon $r = 0$.

To illustrate how this happens let us finally go back to the ansatz (3.1.1) for the metric and to the ansatz (3.1.2) for the vector field strengths. It is convenient to rephrase the same ansatz in the complex formalism well-adapted to the $N = 2$ theory. To this effect we begin by constructing a 2–form which is *anti–self–dual* in the background of the metric (3.1.1) and whose integral on the 2–sphere at infinity S^2_∞ is normalized to 2π. A short calculation yields:

$$\begin{aligned} E^- &= \mathrm{i}\frac{e^{2U(r)}}{r^3}\, dt \wedge \vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{x^a}{r^3}\, dx^b \wedge dx^c \epsilon_{abc} \\ 2\,\pi &= \int_{S^2_\infty} E^- \end{aligned} \tag{3.6.1}$$

and with a little additional effort one obtains:

$$E^-_{\mu\nu}\,\gamma^{\mu\nu} = 2\,\mathrm{i}\frac{e^{2U(r)}}{r^3}\,\gamma_a x^a\,\gamma_0\,\frac{1}{2}\,[\mathbf{1}+\gamma_5] \tag{3.6.2}$$

which will prove of great help in the unfolding of the supersymmetry transformation rules.

Next, introducing the following complex combination of the magnetic charge p^Λ and of the radial function $\ell^\Sigma(r)$ defined by eq. (3.1.2):

$$t^\Lambda(r) \,=\, 2\pi(p^\Lambda + \mathrm{i}\ell^\Lambda(r)) \tag{3.6.3}$$

we can rewrite the ansatz (3.1.2) as:

$$F^{-|\Lambda} \;=\; \frac{t^\Lambda}{4\pi}E^- \tag{3.6.4}$$

and we retrieve the original formulae from:

$$\begin{array}{rcrcl} F^\Lambda &=& 2\mathrm{Re}F^{-|\Lambda} &=& \frac{p^\Lambda}{2r^3}\epsilon_{abc}x^a dx^b\wedge dx^c - \frac{\ell^\Lambda(r)}{r^3}e^{2\mathcal{U}}dt\wedge\vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x} \\ \widetilde{F}^\Lambda &=& -2\mathrm{Im}F^{-|\Lambda} &=& -\frac{\ell^\Lambda(r)}{2r^3}\epsilon_{abc}x^a dx^b\wedge dx^c - \frac{p^\Lambda}{r^3}e^{2\mathcal{U}}dt\wedge\vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x} \end{array} \tag{3.6.5}$$

Before proceeding further it is convenient to define the electric and magnetic charges of the hole as it is appropriate in any electromagnetic theory. Recalling the general form of the field equations and of the Bianchi identities as given in (3.2.15) we see that the field strengths $\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu}$ are both closed 2-forms, since their duals are divergenceless. Hence we can invoke Gauss theorem and claim that their integral on a closed space–like 2–sphere does not depend on the radius of the sphere. These integrals are the electric and magnetic charges of the hole that, in a quantum theory, we expect to be quantized. We set:

$$q_\Lambda \;\equiv\; \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{S^2_\infty} G_{\Lambda|\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu\wedge dx^\nu \tag{3.6.6}$$

$$p^\Sigma \;\equiv\; \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{S^2_\infty} F^\Sigma_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu\wedge dx^\nu \tag{3.6.7}$$

If rather than the integral of G_Λ we were to calculate the integral of $\widetilde{F}^\Lambda$ which is not a closed form we would obtain a function of the radius:

$$4\pi\ell^\Lambda(r) \;=\; -\int_{S^2_r}\widetilde{F}^\Lambda \;=\; 2\mathrm{Im}t^\Lambda \tag{3.6.8}$$

Consider now the supersymmetry transformations rules (3.5.5), (3.5.6) and write the BPS condition:

$$0 \;=\; \mathcal{D}_\mu\,\xi_A \,+\epsilon_{AB}\,T^-_{\mu\nu}\,\gamma^\nu\xi^B \tag{3.6.9}$$

$$0 \;=\; \mathrm{i}\,\nabla_\mu\, z^i\,\gamma^\mu\xi^A + G^{-i}_{\mu\nu}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\xi_B\epsilon^{AB} \tag{3.6.10}$$

where the killing spinor $\xi_A(r)$ satisfies eq.(3.1.5) and is of the form of a single radial function times a constant spinor:

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_A(r) &= e^{f(r)}\chi_A \qquad\qquad \chi_A = \text{constant}\\ \gamma_0\chi_A &= \pm\mathrm{i}\epsilon_{AB}\chi^B\end{aligned} \tag{3.6.11}$$

Inserting eq.s (3.5.8),(3.5.10),(3.6.11) into eq.s(3.6.9), (3.6.10) and using the result (3.6.2), with a little work we obtain the first order differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dz^i}{dr} &= \mp\left(\frac{e^{U(r)}}{4\pi r^2}\right) g^{ij^\star}\overline{f}^\Lambda_{j^\star}(\mathcal{N}-\overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma}t^\Sigma \;=\\ &\quad \mp\left(\frac{e^{U(r)}}{4\pi r^2}\right) g^{ij^\star}\nabla_{j^\star}\overline{Z}(z,\overline{z},p,q)\end{aligned} \tag{3.6.12}$$

$$\frac{dU}{dr} \;=\; \mp\left(\frac{e^{U(r)}}{r^2}\right)(M_\Sigma p^\Sigma - L^\Lambda q_\Lambda) \;=\; \mp\left(\frac{e^{U(r)}}{r^2}\right) Z(z,\overline{z},p,q) \tag{3.6.13}$$

where

1. $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}(z,\overline{z})$ is the period matrix of special geometry defined by eq.(3.4.37)

2. The vector $V = \Big(L^\Lambda(z,\overline{z}), M_\Sigma(z,\overline{z})\Big)$ is the covariantly holomorphic section of the symplectic bundle entering the definition of a Special Kähler manifold (see eq. (3.4.28)

3. $$Z(z,\overline{z},p,q) \equiv \Big(M_\Sigma p^\Sigma - L^\Lambda q_\Lambda\Big) \tag{3.6.14}$$

   is the local realization on the scalar manifold $\mathcal{SM}$ of the central charge of the $N=2$ superalgebra

4. $$Z^i(z,\overline{z},p,q) \equiv g^{ij^\star}\nabla_{j^\star}\overline{Z}(z,\overline{z},p,q) \tag{3.6.15}$$

   are the central charges associated with the matter vectors, the so–called matter central charges

To obtain eqs. (3.6.12),(3.6.13) we made use of the following two properties :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \overline{h}_{j^\star|\Lambda} t^{\star\Sigma} - \overline{f}^{\Lambda}_{j^\star} \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} t^{\star\Sigma} \\ 0 &= M_\Sigma t^{\star\Sigma} - L^\Lambda \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} t^{\star\Sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6.16}$$

which are a direct consequence of the definition (3.4.37) of the period matrix. The electric charges $\ell^\Lambda(r)$ defined in (3.6.8) are *moduli dependent* charges which are functions of the radial direction through the moduli z^i. On the other hand, the *moduli independent* electric charges q_Λ in eqs. (3.6.13),(3.6.12) are those defined by eq.(3.6.6) which, together with p^Λ fulfil a Dirac quantization condition. Their definition allows them to be expressed in terms of of $t^\Lambda(r)$ as follows:

$$q_\Lambda \,=\, \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{N}(z(r), \overline{z}(r)) t(r))_\Lambda \tag{3.6.17}$$

Equation (3.6.17) may be inverted in order to find the moduli dependence of $\ell_\Lambda(r)$. The independence of q_Λ on r is a consequence of one of the Maxwell's equations:

$$\partial_a \left(\sqrt{-g} \widetilde{G}^{a0|\Lambda}(r) \right) \,=\, 0 \Rightarrow \partial_r \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{N}(z(r), \overline{z}(r)) t(r))^\Lambda \,=\, 0 \tag{3.6.18}$$

3.6.1 Fixed scalars and the entropy

In this way we have reduced the condition that the black-hole should be a BPS saturated state to a pair of first order differential equations for the metric scale factor $U(r)$ and for the scalar fields $z^i(r)$. To obtain explicit solutions one should specify the special Kähler manifold one is working with, namely the specific Lagrangian model. There are, however, some very general and interesting conclusions that can be drawn in a model–independent way. They are just consequences of the fact that these BPS conditions are *first order differential equations*. Because of that there are fixed points (see the papers [33, 35, 34]) namely values either of the metric or of the scalar fields which, once attained in the evolution parameter r (= the radial distance) persist indefinitely. The fixed point values are just the zeros of the right hand side in either of the coupled eq.s (3.6.13) and (3.6.12). The fixed point for the metric equation is $r = \infty$, which corresponds to its asymptotic flatness. The fixed point for the moduli is $r = 0$. So, independently from the initial data at $r = \infty$ that determine the details of the evolution, the scalar fields flow into their fixed point values at $r = 0$, which, as we will show, turns out to be a horizon. Indeed in the vicinity of $r = 0$ also the metric takes the universal form of an $AdS_2 \times S^2$, Bertotti Robinson metric.

Let us see this more closely.

To begin with we consider the equations determining the fixed point values for the moduli and the universal form attained by the metric at the moduli fixed point:

$$0 \;=\; -g^{ij^\star}\, \overline{f}^{\Gamma}_{j^\star}\, (\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N})_{\Gamma\Lambda}\; t^\Lambda(0) \tag{3.6.19}$$

$$\frac{dU}{dr} \;\cong\; \mp \left(\frac{e^{U(r)}}{r^2} \right) Z\left(z_{fix}, \overline{z}_{fix}, p, q\right) \tag{3.6.20}$$

Multiplying eq.(3.6.19) by f_i^Σ using the identity (3.4.42) and the definition (3.6.14) of the central charge we conclude that at the fixed point the following condition is true:

$$0 = -\frac{1}{2}\, \frac{t^\Lambda}{4\pi} \,-\, \frac{Z_{fix}\, \overline{L}^\Lambda_{fix}}{8\pi} \tag{3.6.21}$$

In terms of the previously defined electric and magnetic charges (see eq.s (3.6.6),(3.6.7), (3.6.17)) eq.(3.6.21) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\Lambda} &= \mathrm{i}\left(Z_{fix}\,\overline{L}^{\Lambda}_{fix} - \overline{Z}_{fix}\,L^{\Lambda}_{fix}\right) && (3.6.22)\\ q_{\Sigma} &= \mathrm{i}\left(Z_{fix}\,\overline{M}^{fix}_{\Sigma} - \overline{Z}_{fix}\,M^{fix}_{\Sigma}\right) && (3.6.23)\\ Z_{fix} &= M^{fix}_{\Sigma}\,p^{\Sigma} - L^{\Lambda}_{fix}\,q_{\Lambda} && (3.6.24) \end{aligned}$$

which can be regarded as algebraic equations determining the value of the scalar fields at the fixed point as functions of the electric and magnetic charges p^{Λ}, q_{Σ}:

$$L^{\Lambda}_{fix} = L^{\Lambda}(p,q) \;\longrightarrow\; Z_{fix} = Z(p,q) = \mathrm{const} \tag{3.6.25}$$

In the vicinity of the fixed point the differential equation for the metric becomes:

$$\pm\,\frac{dU}{dr} = \frac{Z(p,q)}{r^2}\,e^{U(r)} \tag{3.6.26}$$

which has the approximate solution:

$$\exp[U(r)] \stackrel{r\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \mathrm{const} + \frac{Z(p,q)}{r} \tag{3.6.27}$$

Hence, near $r=0$ the metric (3.1.1) becomes of the Bertotti Robinson type (see eq.(3.1.18)) with Bertotti Robinson mass given by:

$$m^2_{BR} = |Z(p,q)|^2 \tag{3.6.28}$$

In the metric (3.1.18) the surface $r=0$ is light–like and corresponds to a horizon since it is the locus where the Killing vector generating time translations $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, which is time–like at spatial infinity $r=\infty$, becomes light–like. The horizon $r=0$ has a finite area given by:

$$\mathrm{Area}_H = \int_{r=0} \sqrt{g_{\theta\theta}\,g_{\phi\phi}}\,d\theta\,d\phi \;=\; 4\pi\,m^2_{BR} \tag{3.6.29}$$

Hence, independently from the details of the considered model, the BPS saturated black–holes in an N=2 theory have a Bekenstein–Hawking entropy given by the following horizon area:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Area}_H}{4\pi} \;=\; |Z(p,q)|^2 \tag{3.6.30}$$

the value of the central charge being determined by eq.s (3.6.24). Such equations can also be seen as the variational equations for the minimization of the horizon area as given by (3.6.30), if the central charge is regarded as a function of both the scalar fields and the charges:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Area}_H(z,\overline{z}) &= 4\pi\,|Z(z,\overline{z},p,q)|^2\\ \frac{\delta \mathrm{Area}_H}{\delta z} &= 0 \;\longrightarrow\; z = z_{fix} && (3.6.31) \end{aligned}$$

This view point will be pursued in the next chapter where we consider the general properties of *supergravity central charges* and their extremization

Chapter 4

The Structure of Supergravity Central Charges and the Black Hole Entropy

4.1 Introduction

The present one is the central chapter in this series of lectures. As we explained in the introduction the relevance of extremal black holes for string theory is that in the context of a supersymmetric theory the extremality condition, that is the coincidence of the two horizons, can be reinterpreted as the statement that the black hole is a BPS saturated state where the ADM mass is equal to the modulus of the supersymmetry central charge.

Actually in N–extended supersymmetry the central charge is an antisymmetric tensor Z_{AB} that admits several skew eigenvalues (see eq.(1.2.4)) so that the discussion of the BPS condition becomes more involved depending on the structure of these skew eigenvalues. In this chapter we study the general properties of the supergravity central charges and their relation with the horizon area, namely with the black hole entropy. A first instance of such a relation was already derived in the previous chapter in the context of $N = 2$ supergravity where we obtained the fundamental relations (3.6.30) and (3.6.25) expressing the horizon area as the modulus square of the central charge evaluated at the extremum value of the scalars. In the present chapter we put this $N = 2$ result in a much more general perspective and we illustrate its deep meaning. Indeed, after illustrating the general structure and properties of the supergravity central charges, we show that to any lagrangian of type (3.1.21) we can associate an effective one–dimensional field theory that governs the radial dependence of the black hole metric and of the scalar fields. The interactions in such an effective theory are determined by a specific potential, *the geodesic potential* $V(\phi, \vec{Q})$ that depends on the scalar fields and on the electric and magnetic charges of the hole. Finite horizon area black holes are characterized by scalar fields that are regular on the horizon and reach at $r = 0$ extremum values of the geodesic potential. Actually the horizon area and, hence, the black hole entropy is given by the extremum value of the geodesic potential. When the theory is supersymmetric the geodesic potential can be reexpressed as a quadratic positive definite form in the supersymmetry central charges. Hence extremizing the potential and finding the black hole entropy means to extremize such a quadratic form in

the central charges. Using the formal structure of the supergravity central charges and their invariance under the U–duality group one can derive very general properties of the horizon area. Indeed we can show that it is a topological invariant depending solely on the vector $\vec{Q}$ of *quantized electric and magnetic charges* that is also the square root of a quartic algebraic invariant of the U–duality group. This is probably the deepest and most significant aspect of black–hole physics in the context of supergravity. In the next chapter we shall illustrate the concepts introduced in the present one through the explicit construction of $N = 8$ black holes. Here we keep our discussion at a very general level.

4.2 Central Charges in N–extended $D = 4$ supergravity

As we have explained in table 3.1, for $N \geq 3$ the scalar manifold of $D = 4$ supergravity is always a homogeneous coset manifold G/H. Furthermore, as we discussed in section 3.3, the isometry group G is symplectically embedded into $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$, the symbol $\overline{n}$ denoting the total number of vector fields contained in the theory that can either belong to the graviton multiplet (*graviphotons*), or to the matter multiplets, if such multiplets are allowed ($N \leq 4$). Correspondingly if $L(\phi)$ is the coset representative of G/H in some representation of G, we denote by

$$\mathbb{L}_{Sp}(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.2.1}$$

the same coset representative embedded in the fundamental $2\overline{n}$ real representation of $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$. Its blocks $A(\phi), B(\phi), C(\phi), D(\phi)$ can be constructed in terms of the original coset representative $L(\phi)$. Performing the isomorphism transformation (3.3.9) we can rather use a coset representative that is embedded in the fundamental $2\overline{n}$ representation of the group $Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$. We name such a matrix $\mathbb{L}_{Usp}(\phi)$ and for convenience in later manipulations we parametrize it as follows:

$$\mathbb{L}_{Usp} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} f + \mathrm{i}h & \overline{f} + \mathrm{i}\overline{h} \\ f - \mathrm{i}h & \overline{f} - \mathrm{i}\overline{h} \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{C}\mathbb{L}_{Sp}\mathcal{C}^{-1} \tag{4.2.2}$$

Explicitly the relation between the $\overline{n} \times \overline{n}$ complex matrices f and h defined by eq.(4.2.2) and the real blocks of the symplectic coset representative is written below:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A - \mathrm{i}B) \\ h &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(C - \mathrm{i}D) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.3}$$

Explicitly the condition $\mathbb{L}_{Usp} \in Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$ reads as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{i}(f^\dagger h - h^\dagger f) &= \mathbb{1} \\ (f^t h - h^t f) &= 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.2.4}$$

The $\overline{n} \times \overline{n}$ sub–blocks of $\mathbb{L}_{Usp}$ are submatrices f, h which can be decomposed with respect to the isotropy subgroup $H_{Aut} \times H_{matter} \subset G$.

Indeed in all supergravity theories $N \geq 3$, where the scalar manifold is a homogeneous coset G/H, the isotropy subgroup H has the following direct product structure:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_{Aut} \otimes H_{matter} \\ H_{Aut} &= SU(N) \otimes U(1) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.5}$$

where H_{Aut} is the automorphism group of the supersymmetry N–extended algebra, usually called R–symmetry, while H_{matter} is a group related to the structure of the matter multiplets one couples to supergravity. Actually in $D = 4$ there are just two cases: $H_{matter} = SU(n)$ in $N = 3$ and $H_{matter} = SO(n)$ in $N = 4$, as the reader can see by looking at table 3.1. The decomposition we mentioned is the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= (f^{\Lambda}_{AB}, f^{\Lambda}_{I}) \\ h &= (h_{\Lambda AB}, h_{\Lambda I}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.6}$$

where AB is a pair of indices in the antisymmetric representation of $H_{Aut} = SU(N) \times U(1)$ and I is an index in the fundamental representation of H_{matter}. Upper $SU(N)$ indices label objects in the complex conjugate representation of $SU(N)$, as we have already emphasized while discussing the $N = 2$ case (see for example formula (3.5.2) and following ones):

$$(f^{\Lambda}_{AB})^* = f^{\Lambda AB} \quad \text{and similarly for the other cases} \tag{4.2.7}$$

Note that we can consider $(f^{\Lambda}_{AB}, h_{\Lambda AB})$ and $(f^{\Lambda}_{I}, h_{\Lambda I})$ as symplectic sections of a $Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ bundle over the G/H base manifold. We will prove in the following that this bundle is actually flat. The real embedding given by $\mathbb{L}_{Sp}$ is appropriate for duality transformations of $\mathcal{F}^{\pm}$ and their duals $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$, according to equations (3.2.19), while the complex embedding in the matrix $\mathbb{L}_{Usp}$ is appropriate in writing down the supersymmetry transformation rules of the fermions and of the vectors. The kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}$, given by the Gaillard–Zumino master formula (3.3.17), can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{N} = h f^{-1}, \qquad \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}^t \tag{4.2.8}$$

Using (4.2.4)and (4.2.8) we find

$$(f^t)^{-1} = \mathrm{i}(\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}})\overline{f} \tag{4.2.9}$$

that, more explicitly reads

$$f_{AB\Lambda} \equiv (f^{-1})_{AB\Lambda} = \mathrm{i}(\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma}\overline{f}^{\Sigma}_{AB} \tag{4.2.10}$$

$$f_{I\Lambda} \equiv (f^{-1})_{I\Lambda} = \mathrm{i}(\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma}\overline{f}^{\Sigma}_{I} \tag{4.2.11}$$

Similarly to the $N = 2$ case, the graviphoton field strengths and the matter field strengths, whose integrals yield the central and matter charges, are defined by the symplectic invariant, scalar field dressed, combinations of $F^{\Lambda}_{\mu\nu}$ fields appearing in the fermion supersymmetry transformation rules. In other words there exists a generalization of formulae (3.5.5),(3.5.6) and (3.5.8),(3.5.9),(3.5.10),(3.5.11) that we presently describe. In extended supergravity there are three kinds of fermions:

1. The gravitino $\psi_{A\mu}$ which carries an R–symmetry index A running in the fundamental of $SU(N)$, the chirality assignments being as described in eq.s(3.5.2),(3.5.3).

2. The dilatino fields χ_{ABC}, that are spin 1/2 members of the graviton multiplet (for $N \geq 3$) and transform in the three times antisymmetric representation of $SU(N)$. Their chirality assignment is:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_5\, \chi_{ABC} &= \chi_{ABC} \\ \gamma_5\, \chi^{ABC} &= -\chi^{ABC} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.12}$$

3. The gauginos λ^I_A that are spin 1/2 members of the vector multiplets and transform in the fundamental representation of the R–symmetry $SU(N)$. For $N = 3, 4$ they are also in the fundamental representation of the H_{matter} group, respectively $SU(n)$ or $SO(n)$. In the $N = 2$ case, where the scalar multiplet is not necessarily a coset manifold G/H, the index I is replaced by the world index $i^\star$, since the gaugino transforms as a section of the antiholomorphic tangent bundle (see eq.s (3.5.4))

The supersymmetry transformation laws of these fermion fields on bosonic backgrounds are

$$\delta\psi_{A\mu} = \nabla_\mu\epsilon_A - \frac{1}{4}T^{(-)}_{AB|\rho\sigma}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\gamma_\mu\epsilon^B = 0 \tag{4.2.13}$$

$$\delta\chi_{ABC} = 4\mathrm{i}\ P_{ABCD|i}\partial_\mu\Phi^i\gamma^\mu\epsilon^D - 3T^{(-)}_{[AB|\rho\sigma}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\,\epsilon_{C]} = 0 \tag{4.2.14}$$

for the gravitino and dilatino, respectively, and

$$\delta\lambda^I_A = aP^I_{AB,i}\partial_a\phi^i\gamma^a\epsilon^B + b\,T^{-I}_{ab}\gamma^{ab}\epsilon_A \tag{4.2.15}$$

for the gaugino, a, b being some numerical coefficients, depending on the model and unessential for the purpose of the present discussion. Furthermore the dressed graviphoton and matter field strengths are defined by the following equations, completely analogous to equations ((3.5.8) and following ones):

$$\begin{aligned}
T^-_{AB} &= \mathrm{i}(\overline{f}^{-1})_{AB\Lambda}F^{-\Lambda} = f^\Lambda_{AB}(\mathcal{N}-\overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{-\Sigma} = h_{\Lambda AB}F^{-\Lambda} - f^\Lambda_{AB}\mathcal{G}^-_\Lambda \\
T^-_I &= \mathrm{i}(\overline{f}^{-1})_{I\Lambda}F^{-\Lambda} = f^\Lambda_I(\mathcal{N}-\overline{\mathcal{N}})_{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{-\Sigma} = h_{\Lambda I}F^{-\Lambda} - f^\Lambda_I\mathcal{G}^-_\Lambda \\
\overline{T}^{+AB} &= (T^-_{AB})^* \\
\overline{T}^{+I} &= (T^-_I)^*
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.16}$$

Obviously, for $N > 4$, $f_{\Lambda I} = T_I = 0$. Note also that the right hand side of eq.s (4.2.16) makes it explicit the symplectic invariance of the dressed field strengths.

Finally, in order to complete our description of the supersymmetry transformation rules, let us explain the meaning of the H_{Aut} antisymmetric tensors $P_{ABCD|i}, P_{AB\,I|i}$ (the index i is a world index labelling G/H coordinates). As it will be clear in the sequel these correspond to a decomposition of the G/H coset manifold vielbein into irreducible representations of the isotropy subgroup H. What is general in this decomposition is that, for all N–cases, we always obtain the required representations needed to make sense of the supersymmetry transformation rules (4.2.13),(4.2.14),(4.2.15). This happens because the choice of G/H is completely determined by supersymmetry.

In full analogy to what we did in the $N = 2$ case we can now construct *field dependent central and matter charges*, by integrating the dressed field strengths $T_{AB} = T^+_{AB} + T^-_{AB}$ and (for $N = 3, 4$) $T_I = T^+_I + T^-_I$ on a two–sphere of radius r. As before these objects depend on r since the corresponding field strength is not conserved. Note that as already discussed in the $N = 2$ case we always assume spherical symmetry and hence purely radial dependence of the scalar and vector fields. For this purpose we note that

$$T^+_{AB} = h_{\Lambda AB}F^{+\Lambda} - f^\Lambda_{AB}\mathcal{G}^+_\Lambda = 0 \tag{4.2.17}$$

$$T^+_I = h_{\Lambda I}F^{+\Lambda} - f^\Lambda_I\mathcal{G}^+_\Lambda = 0 \tag{4.2.18}$$

as a consequence of eqs. (4.2.8) and (3.2.22). Therefore we have:

$$Z_{AB} = \int_{S^2} T_{AB} = \int_{S^2} (T^+_{AB} + T^-_{AB}) = \int_{S^2} T^-_{AB} = h_{\Lambda AB}(r)p^\Lambda - f^\Lambda_{AB}(r)q_\Lambda \quad (4.2.19)$$

$$Z_I = \int_{S^2} T_I = \int_{S^2} (T^+_I + T^-_I) = \int_{S^2} T^-_I = h_{\Lambda I}(r)p^\Lambda - f^\Lambda_I(r)q_\Lambda \quad (N \leq 4) \quad (4.2.20)$$

where:

$$q_\Lambda = \int_{S^2} \mathcal{G}_\Lambda, \quad p^\Lambda = \int_{S^2} F^\Lambda \quad (4.2.21)$$

are the conserved quantized charges defined as in eq.(3.6.6) and (3.6.7). We see that the central and matter charges are given by symplectic invariants and that the presence of dyons in $D = 4$ is related to the symplectic embedding.

4.2.1 Differential relations obeyed by the dressed charges

Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{L}^{-1}_{Usp} d\mathbb{L}_{Usp}$ be the $Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$ Lie algebra left invariant 1–form satisfying the Maurer Cartan equation:

$$d\Gamma + \Gamma \wedge \Gamma = 0 \quad (4.2.22)$$

Note that the above equation (4.2.22) actually implies the flatness of the symplectic bundle over G/H we have already mentioned.

In terms of the matrices (f, h) the 1–form Γ reads:

$$\Gamma \equiv \mathbb{L}^{-1}_{Usp} d\mathbb{L}_{Usp} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{i}(f^\dagger dh - h^\dagger df) & \mathrm{i}(f^\dagger d\overline{h} - h^\dagger d\overline{f}) \\ -\mathrm{i}(f^t dh - h^t df) & -\mathrm{i}(f^t d\overline{h} - h^t d\overline{f}) \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Omega^{(H)} & \overline{\mathcal{P}} \\ \mathcal{P} & \overline{\Omega}^{(H)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2.23)$$

where the $\overline{n} \times \overline{n}$ sub–blocks $\Omega^{(H)}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ embed the H connection and the G/H vielbein, respectively. This identification follows from the Cartan decomposition of the $Usp(\overline{n}, \overline{n})$ Lie algebra. Explicitly, if we define the $H_{Aut} \times H_{matter}$–covariant derivative of a vector $V = (V_{AB}, V_I)$ as:

$$\nabla V = dV - V\omega, \quad \omega = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^{AB}{}_{CD} & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^I{}_J \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2.24)$$

from (4.2.2) and (4.2.23), we obtain the $(\overline{n} \times \overline{n})$ matrix equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(\omega)(f + \mathrm{i}h) &= (\overline{f} + \mathrm{i}\overline{h})\mathcal{P} \\ \nabla(\omega)(f - \mathrm{i}h) &= (\overline{f} - \mathrm{i}\overline{h})\mathcal{P} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.25)$$

together with their complex conjugates. Using further the definition (4.2.6) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(\omega) f^\Lambda_{AB} &= \overline{f}^\Lambda_I P^I_{AB} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{f}^{\Lambda CD} P_{ABCD} \\ \nabla(\omega) f^\Lambda_I &= \frac{1}{2}\overline{f}^{\Lambda AB} P_{ABI} + \overline{f}^{\Lambda J} P_{JI} \end{aligned} \quad (4.2.26)$$

where we have decomposed the embedded vielbein $\mathcal{P}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{P} = \begin{pmatrix} P_{ABCD} & P_{ABJ} \\ P_{ICD} & P_{IJ} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2.27)$$

the sub–blocks being related to the vielbein of G/H, $P = L^{-1}\nabla^{(H)}L$, written in terms of the indices of $H_{Aut} \times H_{matter}$. Note that, since f belongs to the unitary matrix $\mathbb{I}_{Usp}$, we have: $(f^{\Lambda}_{AB}, f^{\Lambda}_{I})^{\star} = (\overline{f}^{\Lambda AB}, \overline{f}^{\Lambda I})$. Obviously, the same differential relations that we wrote for f hold true for the dual matrix h as well.

Using the definition of the charges (4.2.19), (4.2.20) we then get the following differential relations among charges:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(\omega) Z_{AB} &= \overline{Z}_I P^I_{AB} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{Z}^{CD} P_{ABCD} \\ \nabla(\omega) Z_I &= \frac{1}{2}\overline{Z}^{AB} P_{ABI} + \overline{Z}_J P^J_I \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.28}$$

Depending on the coset manifold, some of the blocks of (4.2.27) can be actually zero. For example in $N = 3$ the vielbein of $G/H = SU(3,n)/SU(3) \times SU(n) \times U(1)$ [36] is P_{IAB} (AB antisymmetric), $I = 1, \cdots, n; A, B = 1, 2, 3$ and it turns out that $P_{ABCD} = P_{IJ} = 0$.

In $N = 4$, $G/H = SU(1,1)/U(1) \otimes O(6,n)/O(6) \times O(n)$ [37], and we have $P_{ABCD} = \epsilon_{ABCD} P$, $P_{IJ} = \overline{P}\delta_{IJ}$, where P is the Kählerian vielbein of $\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}$, ($A, \cdots, D$ $SU(4)$ indices and I, J $O(n)$ indices) and P_{IAB} is the vielbein of $O(6,n)/O(6) \times O(n)$.

For $N > 4$ (no matter indices) we have that $\mathcal{P}$ coincides with the vielbein P_{ABCD} of the relevant G/H.

4.2.2 Sum rules satisfied by central charges

Besides the differential relations (4.2.28), the charges also satisfy a sum rule that we presently describe.

The sum rule has the following form:

$$\frac{1}{2} Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} + Z_I \overline{Z}^I = -\frac{1}{2} Q^t \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{N}) Q \tag{4.2.29}$$

where $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{N})$ and Q are:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & -\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N} \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ -\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.2.30}$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} p^{\Lambda} \\ q_{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.2.31}$$

In order to obtain this result we just need to observe that from the fundamental identities (4.2.4) and from the definition of the kinetic matrix given in (4.2.8) it follows:

$$ff^{\dagger} = -\mathrm{i}\left(\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}}\right)^{-1} \tag{4.2.32}$$

$$hh^{\dagger} = -\mathrm{i}\left(\overline{\mathcal{N}}^{-1} - \mathcal{N}^{-1}\right)^{-1} \equiv -\mathrm{i}\mathcal{N}\left(\mathcal{N} - \overline{\mathcal{N}}\right)^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{N}} \tag{4.2.33}$$

$$hf^{\dagger} = \mathcal{N} f f^{\dagger} \tag{4.2.34}$$

$$fh^{\dagger} = f f^{\dagger}\overline{\mathcal{N}} \tag{4.2.35}$$

Note that if we go back to the $N = 2$ case treated in the previous chapter, the sum rule on the central and matter charges (4.2.29) takes the form:

$$|Z|^2 + |Z_i|^2 \equiv |Z|^2 + Z_i g^{i\overline{j}} \overline{Z}_{\overline{j}} = -\frac{1}{2} Q^t \mathcal{M} Q \tag{4.2.36}$$

with the same right hand side as in the previous discussion.

4.3 The geodesic potential

At this point we can use the information we have so far collected on the central and matter charges in a different way that makes no direct reference to supersymmetry and enlightens the significance of the scalar field functional:

$$V(\phi, Q) = -\frac{1}{2} Q^t \, \mathcal{M}\left(\mathcal{N}\right) \, Q \tag{4.3.1}$$

introduced in the sum rule (4.2.29),(4.2.36).

To this effect we consider the general action (3.1.21) and the ansatz (3.1.1) for the metric, (3.1.2) for the vector fields and (3.1.3) for the scalars. From such an action one can derive the field equations varying with respect to the metric, the vector fields and the scalars. Inserting the above ansatz such equations reduce to a system of second order ordinary differential equations in the variable r for the unknown functions $U(r)$ and $\phi^I(r)$. We can think of such equations as the Euler Lagrange equations derived from an effective action which is quite straightforward to write down. Such an effective action has the following explicit form:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{eff} &\equiv \int \mathcal{L}_{eff}(\tau)\, d\tau \quad ; \quad \tau = -\frac{1}{r} \\ \mathcal{L}_{eff}(\tau) &= \left(\frac{dU}{d\tau}\right)^2 + g_{IJ} \frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau} \frac{d\phi^J}{d\tau} + e^{2U} V(\phi, Q) \end{aligned} \tag{4.3.2}$$

where the potential $V(\phi)$ appearing in (4.3.2) is the same object defined in eq. (4.3.1). Actually the field equations from the original action are equivalent to the variational equations obtained from the effective action (4.3.2) provided we add to them also the following constraint:

$$\left(\frac{dU}{d\tau}\right)^2 g_{IJ} \frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau} \frac{d\phi^J}{d\tau} - e^{2U} V(\phi, Q) \cong 0 \tag{4.3.3}$$

Let us first consider a simple case where we assume that the scalar fields are constants from *horizon* $r = 0$ to *infinity* $r = \infty$:

$$\phi^I = \text{constant} = \phi^I_\infty \tag{4.3.4}$$

Extremal black–holes satisfying such an additional simplifying condition (4.3.4) are named *double extreme black holes*.

It follows from (4.3.3), upon use of (4.3.4) that:

$$\left(\frac{dU}{d\tau}\right)^2 = e^{2U} V(\phi, Q) \tag{4.3.5}$$

At the horizon $\tau \to -\infty$, the metric (3.1.1) must approach the Bertotti Robinson metric (3.1.18), as we already discussed in complete generality, so that we have a boundary condition for the differential equation (4.3.5):

$$e^{2U(\tau)} \stackrel{\tau\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{m_{BR}^2}\frac{1}{\tau^2} = \frac{4\pi}{\text{Area}_H}\frac{1}{\tau^2} \tag{4.3.6}$$

where m_{BR} is the Bertotti Robinson mass and Area_H is the area of the horizon, related to the first by eq.(3.6.29). Using this information, for double extreme black holes we have:

$$V(\phi_H, Q) = \frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} \tag{4.3.7}$$

where ϕ_H denotes the value of the scalar fields at the horizon, which in this case is the same as their value at infinity. Actually the result (4.3.7) is more general and it is true also for generic extremal black–holes where we relax condition (4.3.4) but we still assume that the kinetic term of the scalars ϕ^I (that in the original lagrangian (3.1.21) and not that in the effective action) should be finite at the horizon:

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} g_{IJ}\frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau}\frac{d\phi^J}{d\tau}e^{2U}\tau^4 < \infty \tag{4.3.8}$$

Indeed, using again the boundary condition (4.3.6) on U we find:

$$g_{IJ}\frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau}\frac{d\phi^J}{d\tau}\frac{4\pi}{\text{Area}_H}\tau^2 \stackrel{\tau\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} X^2 = \text{finite quantity} \tag{4.3.9}$$

However, we must have $X^2 = 0$ if the moduli ϕ are assumed to be finite at the horizon. Indeed, if $X^2 \neq 0$, near the horizon we can write:

$$\tau\frac{d\phi^I}{d\tau} \stackrel{\tau\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \text{const} \quad \to \quad \phi^I \sim \text{const} \times \log\tau \tag{4.3.10}$$

Hence also for generic extremal black–holes the same conclusion reached before in eq. (4.3.7) holds true.

Hence the area of the horizon is expressed in terms of the finite value reached by the scalars at the horizon. But what is such a value? We can easily show that ϕ_H^I is determined by the following extremization of the potential (4.3.1):

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi^I}|_H = 0 \tag{4.3.11}$$

Indeed considering the variational equation for the scalar fields derived from the effective action (4.3.2) we have:

$$\frac{D^2}{d\tau^2}\phi^I = \frac{1}{2}e^{2U}\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi^I}g^{IJ} \tag{4.3.12}$$

Near the horizon the contribution from the quadratic terms proportional to the Levi Civita connection $\Gamma^I_{JK}\, d_\tau\,\phi^J\, d_\tau\phi^K$ vanishes so that eq.(4.3.12) reduces to:

$$\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\phi^I \cong \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi^I}g^{IJ}\frac{4\pi}{\text{Area}_H}\frac{1}{\tau^2} \tag{4.3.13}$$

whose solution is:

$$\phi^I \sim \frac{2\pi}{\text{Area}_H} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi^I} g^{IJ} \log \tau + \phi^I_H \tag{4.3.14}$$

Invoking once again the finiteness of the scalar fields ϕ at the horizon we conclude that their the extremum condition (4.3.11) must be true in order to be consistent with eq. (4.3.14).

In this way we have reached, for the general case of an extremal black hole with a finite horizon area, the same conclusion we had reached in section 3.6.1 for such a black hole in the context of $N = 2$ supergravity. Namely the scalars flow at the horizon at a fixed point that is determined as the extremum of a potential. In the $N = 2$ case we obtained the equations (3.6.24) determining the horizon values by starting from the BPS conditions (3.6.12) and (3.6.13) and imposing that we are at the fixed point of the first order differential equations. We already anticipated that the same result could be obtained by extremizing a potential, whose value at the horizon is the horizon area. We can now verify explicitly such a statement. To this effect we should stress that in the supersymmetric case the *geodesic potential* appearing in the effective action (4.3.2) and defined in eq.(4.3.1) is the right hand side of the *central and matter charges sum rule* of eq.(4.2.29) or (4.2.36) for the $N = 2$ case. Hence extremizing the geodesic potential, in supersymmetric cases is the same thing as extremizing the left hand side of the sum rule. For the $N = 2$ case we find:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dz^i}\left(Z\,\overline{Z} + g^{ij^\star}\, Z_i\, \overline{Z}_{j^\star}\right) \\ &= \nabla_i Z\, \overline{Z} + \nabla_i Z_j\, \overline{Z}_{j^\star}\, g^{jk^\star} + Z_j\, \nabla_i\, \overline{Z}_{k^\star}\, g^{jk^\star} \\ &= \nabla_i Z\, \overline{Z} + \mathrm{i}\, C_{ijm}\, \overline{Z}_{\ell^\star}\, \overline{Z}_{k^\star}\, g^{\ell^\star m}\, g^{jk^\star} + Z_j\, Z\, \delta^i_j \end{aligned} \tag{4.3.15}$$

where we have used the special geometry identities (3.4.36) and the already quoted identification (see (3.6.14)and following ones):

$$Z_i = \nabla_i Z \tag{4.3.16}$$

Indeed the special geometry identities holding true on the symplectic sections and their derivatives are automatically extended to the central and matter charges that are linear combinations of such sections with constant coefficients (the quantized charges). From eq.(4.3.15) it immediately follows that the extremum condition translates into eq.(3.6.19) since it implies:

$$Z_i = \nabla_i Z = 0 \quad \longrightarrow \quad \partial_i\, |Z|^2 = 0 \tag{4.3.17}$$

Hence the horizon area is indeed minimum and, as we claimed in section 3.6.1, the fixed values of the scalars are obtained by extremizing such an area.

4.4 General properties of central charges at the extremum

The geodesic potential (4.3.1), whose extrema correspond to the finite values reached by the scalar fields at the horizon of an extremal black–hole, can be rewritten as the left hand side of eq.(4.2.29) in the case of a supersymmetric theory. This statement must be interpreted in the following way. We are free to consider an arbitrary theory of gravity coupled to scalar and vector fields described by an action of type (3.1.21). If supersymmetry is not advocated no special relation exists on the number of scalars relative to the number of vectors and any

symplectically embedded scalar manifold is allowed. For any such theory there is a *period matrix* $\mathcal{N}$ and correspondingly we can construct the potential (4.3.1). We are also free to look for extremal black–solutions of such a theory and, according to the discussion presented in the previous section, the value attained by the scalars at the horizon is determined by eq.(4.3.11), provided we look for *finite horizon area* solutions. Yet it is only in the supersymmetric case that there exists a concept of central charges of the supersymmetry algebra and in that case the geodesic potential can be rewritten as a sum of squares of such charges:

$$V^{SUSY}\left(\phi,\vec{Q}\right) = \frac{1}{2}Z_{AB}\overline{Z}^{AB} + Z_I\overline{Z}^I \tag{4.4.1}$$

We can reconsider the extremization of the geodesic potential from the point of view of its supersymmetric reinterpretation (4.4.1). Writing the extremum condition as the vanishing of the exterior differential, we immediately get:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= dV^{SUSY}\left(\phi,\vec{Q}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\,\nabla Z_{AB}\,\overline{Z}^{AB} + \frac{1}{2}\,Z_{AB}\,\nabla\overline{Z}^{AB} + \nabla Z_I\,\overline{Z}^I + Z_I\,\nabla\overline{Z}^I \end{aligned} \tag{4.4.2}$$

and inserting the differential relations (4.2.28) into (4.4.2) we obtain the following condition:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{Z}^I\,P_{I|AB} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{Z}^{CD}\,P_{ABCD}\right)\overline{Z}^{AB} + \text{c.c}\right] \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{Z}^{AB}\,P_{AB|I} + \overline{Z}^J\,P_{J|I}\right)\overline{Z}^J + \text{c.c}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{4.4.3}$$

Since the scalar vielbein provides a frame of independent 1–forms on the scalar manifold, eq.(4.4.3) can be true only if the coefficients of each vielbein component vanishes independently. This implies that, at the extremum, the following conditions on the central and matter charges have to be true:

$$Z_I^{fix} = 0 \tag{4.4.4}$$

$$Z^{fix}_{[AB}\,Z^{fix}_{CD]} = 0 \tag{4.4.5}$$

Eq.s (4.4.4) and (4.4.5) are the higher N generalization of the extremum condition (4.3.17) we found in the case of $N = 2$ supergravity. As we see for all values of N the matter charges Z_I vanish at the horizon. In the $N = 2$ case where the matter charges can be interpreted as the moduli covariant derivatives of the unique central charge condition (4.4.4) suffices to determine the extremum. In the higher N case where the central charge is an antisymmetric $N \times N$ matrix, the extremum is characterized by the additional algebraic condition (4.4.5). Its meaning becomes clear if we make a local $SU(N)$ R–symmetry transformation that reduces the central charge tensor to its *normal frame* where it is skew–diagonal (see eq.(1.2.4)). Focusing on the $N = 2p = even$ case, in the normal frame the only non–vanishing entries are

$$Z_1^{fix} \equiv Z^{fix}_{1\,2}\ ,\ Z_2^{fix} \equiv Z^{fix}_{3\,4}\ ,\ \ldots\ ,\ Z^{fix}_{N/2} \equiv Z^{fix}_{N-1\,N} \tag{4.4.6}$$

and equation (4.4.5) implies that either all vanish, or at most one of them, say $Z_1^{fix} = Z_{12}^{fix}$, is non zero while all the other vanish. Hence the constraint (4.4.5) yields two possibilities:

$$\text{solutions of the constraint} = \begin{cases} 1^{st}\text{ solution}: & Z_i^{fix} = 0 \quad ; \quad (i = 1,\ldots,p) \\ 2^{nd}\text{ solution}: & \begin{cases} Z_1^{fix} \neq 0 \\ Z_i^{fix} \quad\quad ; \quad (i = 2,\ldots,p) \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{4.4.7}$$

On the other hand, recalling (4.3.7) we have:

$$\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} | Z_i^{fix} |^2 \tag{4.4.8}$$

so that if the horizon area (and hence the entropy) of the black–hole has to be finite then we can exclude the first possibility in eq.(4.4.7) and we find:

$$\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} = | Z_1^{fix} |^2 > 0 \tag{4.4.9}$$

Eq.(4.4.9) is the higher N generalization of eq.(3.6.30) holding true in the $N = 2$ case. It leads to the following very important conclusion:

Statement 4.4.1 *BPS saturated black–holes are classified by the skew–eigenvalue structure of their central charge Z_{AB} evaluated at the horizon. The only BPS black–holes that have a non vanishing entropy $Area_H/4\pi > 0$ are those admitting a single non-zero skew–eigenvalue Z_1^{fix} while all the other Z_i^{fix} vanish.*

4.5 The horizon area as a topological U duality invariant

As we just saw the horizon area can be found by extremizing the geodesic potential and then replacing the fixed values of the scalars in eq. (4.3.7). Since the only parameters appearing in the geodesic potential (4.3.1) are the quantized charges $\{p^\Lambda, q_\Sigma\}$, it follows that the fixed values of the scalars will depend only on such quantized charges and so will do the horizon area:

$$\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} = S(p, q) \tag{4.5.1}$$

On the other hand we recall that, by construction the geodesic potential is a symplectic invariant and hence an invariant under U–duality transformations. Consider for instance the $N > 4$ supersymmetric case where the geodesic potential is expressed as in eq.(4.4.1) with no matter charges Z_I. Introduce the charge vector (4.2.31) that transforms in the appropriate *real symplectic representation* of the U duality group which defines the symplectic embedding of the coset manifold U/H. Then recall the definition (4.2.19) of the central charges and eq.(4.2.2) which relates the complex Usp–realization $\mathbb{L}_{Usp}(\phi)$ of the coset representative to its real symplectic version $\mathbb{L}_{Sp}(\phi)$. By straightforward algebra we verify that the geodesics potential is nothing else but the following bi–quadratic form in the charge vector and in the coset representative:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi, \vec{Q}) &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\, \overline{Z}^{AB}(\phi)\, Z_{AB}(\phi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\, \vec{Q}^T \left[\mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\phi)\right]^T \mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\phi)\, \vec{Q} \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.2}$$

The invariance under the U–transformations is verified in the following way. By definition of coset representative, if $A \in U \subset Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$ we have:

$$\mathbb{L}_{Sp}(\mathcal{A}\phi) = A\, \mathbb{L}_{Sp}(\phi)\, W_A(\phi) \tag{4.5.3}$$

$$W_A(\phi) \in H \subset U(\overline{n}) \subset Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R}) \implies [W_A(\phi)]^T\, W_A(\phi) = \mathbb{1} \tag{4.5.4}$$

where $\mathcal{A}\phi$ denotes the non–linear action of the U group element A on the scalar fields ϕ and $W_A(\phi)$ is the H–compensator that in the symplectic representation is an orthogonal matrix (indeed we have $U(\overline{n}) = SO(2\overline{n}) \cap Sp(2\overline{n}, \mathbb{R})$). Relying on eq.(4.5.4) and on the representation (4.5.2) of the geodesic potential we find:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{A}\phi, A\vec{Q}) &= \vec{Q}^T A^T \left[\mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}\phi)\right]^T \mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}\phi)\, A\vec{Q} \\ &= \vec{Q}^T A^T [A^{-1}]^T \left[\mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\phi)\right]^T [W_A^{-1}(\phi)]^T W_A^{-1}(\phi) \mathbb{L}_{Sp}^{-1}(\phi)\, A^{-1} A \vec{Q} \\ &= V(\phi, \vec{Q}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.5}$$

which explicitly proves the U invariance of of the geodesic potential. It follows that also the horizon area $S(p,q)$ obtained by substitution of the fixed scalar values in $V(\phi, Q)$ will be a U invariant. Not only that. Eq.(4.5.2) shows that the invariant $I(p,q)$ must be homogenous of order two in the charge vector $\vec{Q}$. At this point we can just rely on group theory. The geodesic potential is bi–quadratic in the charge vector and in the coset representative. Hence $S(p,q)$ cannot be just a quadratic invariant since it is obtained by substitution of $\phi^{fix} = \phi(p,q)$ into an expression that is already quadratic in the charge vector. The other possibility is that $S(p,q)$ be the square root of a quartic invariant. Hence we can guess the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi} \equiv S(p,q) = \sqrt{Q^\Lambda Q^\Sigma Q^\Delta Q^\Gamma d_{\Lambda\Sigma\Delta\Gamma}} \tag{4.5.6}$$

where $d_{\Lambda\Sigma\Delta\Gamma}$ is a *four-index symmetric invariant tensor* of the U duality group in the real representation that defines the symplectic embedding of the manifold U/H. For instance in the case of $N = 8$ supergravity where $U = E_{7(7)}$ a four-index symmetric invariant tensor does indeed exist in the fundamental **56** representation. The horizon area of an $N = 8$ BPS black–hole is correctly given by eq.(4.5.6). We explicitly verify this statement in the next chapter by solving the appropriate differential equations and computing the horizon area. Here we pursue a more abstract discussion. Having established that the square of the horizon area is a quartic U–invariant we can try to construct it as an appropriate linear combination of H–invariants. We start from the central charges $Z_{AB}(p,q,\phi)$ that are linear in the charge vector $\vec{Q}$ and that transform covariantly under the compensating subgroup H. We consider the possible H–invariants $I_i\left(Z(p,q,\phi)\right)$ that are quartic in the central charges Z_{AB} and we write the ansatz:

$$S^2(p,q) = I = \sum_i \alpha_i\, I_i\left(Z(p,q,\phi)\right) \tag{4.5.7}$$

where α_i are numerical coefficients. For arbitrary α_i values I is a function of the scalar fields ϕ through the scalar field dependence of the central charges. Yet for special choices of the coefficients α_i the H–invariant I can be independent from the ϕ^I. We argue that such a linear combination of H–invariants is the quartic U–invariant we look for. To find the appropriate α_i it suffices to impose:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^I} I = 0 \tag{4.5.8}$$

This is a very much indirect way of constructing U–invariants that has a distinctive advantage. It puts into evidence the relation between the black–hole horizon area and the eigenvalues of the central charge. As an example we consider the $N = 8$ case.

4.5.1 Construction of the quartic $E_{7(7)}$ invariant in the $N = 8$ theory

In the $N = 8$ case we have $U = E_{7(7)}$, $H = SU(8)$ and the central charge Z_{AB} is in the complex **28** representation of $SU(8)$. There are three quartic $SU(8)$ invariants that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\equiv \left(Z_{AB}\,\overline{Z}^{BA}\right)^2 \\ I_2 &\equiv Z_{AB}\,\overline{Z}^{BC}\,Z_{CD}\,\overline{Z}^{DA} \\ I_3 &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2!4!}\epsilon^{ABCDEFGH}\,Z_{AB}\,Z_{CD}\,Z_{EF}\,Z_{GH}\,+\text{c.c}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.9}$$

We can easily determine the coefficients $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ by going to the normal frame. Naming the four skew-eigenvalues as in eq.(4.4.6) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= 4\left(\sum_{i=1}^{4}|Z_i|^2\right)^2 \\ I_2 &= 2\sum_{i<j}|Z_i|^2\,|Z_j|^2 \\ I_3 &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{4}Z_i + \prod_{i=1}^{4}\overline{Z}_i\right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.10}$$

On the other hand, naming:

$$P_1 = P_{1234} \quad ; \quad P_2 = P_{1256} \quad ; \quad P_3 = P_{1278} \tag{4.5.11}$$

the differential relations (4.2.28) reduce in the normal frame to:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla Z_1 &= P_1\,\overline{Z}_2 + P_2\,\overline{Z}_3 + P_3\,\overline{Z}_4 \\ \nabla Z_2 &= P_1\,\overline{Z}_1 + P_3\,\overline{Z}_3 + P_2\,\overline{Z}_4 \\ \nabla Z_3 &= P_2\,\overline{Z}_1 + P_3\,\overline{Z}_2 + P_1\,\overline{Z}_4 \\ \nabla Z_4 &= P_3\,\overline{Z}_1 + P_2\,\overline{Z}_2 + P_1\,\overline{Z}_3 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.12}$$

Inserting eq.s (4.5.12) and (4.5.10) in the condition

$$d\left(\sum_{i=1}^{3}\alpha_i\,I_i\right) = 0 \tag{4.5.13}$$

and cancelling separately the terms proportional to P_i, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ we obtain $\alpha_1 = 1/4$, $\alpha_2 = -1$, $\alpha_3 = 8$.

Hence we can finally write:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\text{Area}_H}{4\pi}\right)^2 &= \frac{1}{4}\,I_1 - I_2 + 8\,I_3 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(|Z_i|^2\right)^2 - 2\sum_{i<j}|Z_i|^2\,|Z_j|^2 + 4\left(\prod_{i=1}^{4}Z_i + \prod_{i=1}^{4}\overline{Z}_i\right) \\ &= (\rho_1+\rho_2+\rho_3+\rho_4)\,(\rho_1+\rho_2-\rho_3-\rho_4)\,\times \\ &\quad \times(\rho_1-\rho_2+\rho_3-\rho_4)\,(\rho_1-\rho_2-\rho_3+\rho_4) \\ &\quad +8\rho_1\,\rho_2\,\rho_3\,\rho_4\,(\cos\theta - 1) \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.14}$$

The last equality in eq.(4.5.14) has been obtained by writing the four skew eigenvalues Z_i in the following way:

$$Z_i = \rho_i \, \exp[\mathrm{i}\theta] \quad ; \quad \rho_i \in \mathbb{R} \tag{4.5.15}$$

where θ is a common phase. The central charge Z_{AB} can always be reduced to such a form because after the matrix has been skew–diagonalized we still have enough $SU(8)$ transformations to gauge away the three relative phases of the eigenvalues. An alternative and more intrinsic way of seeing that the truly independent parameters are **5**, namely the 4 moduli ρ_i plus the overall phase θ, is to observe that the stability subgroup of Z_{AB} in the normal form is $(SU(2))^4$. Then it suffices to count the dimensionality of the coset

$$\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \frac{SU(8)}{(SU(2))^4} \; = \; 51 \tag{4.5.16}$$

to conclude that 51 of the 56 real components of Z_{AB} can be gauged away leaving a residual 5.

Statement 4.5.1 *The most general $N = 8$ BPS black–solution depends on 5 intrinsic parameters and its horizon area is given by eq.(4.5.14) in terms of such parameters.*

From eq.s(4.5.14),(4.5.15) we see that there are three possible cases:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \rho_1 > \rho_2 > \rho_3 > \rho_4 \geq 0 & \mathrm{Area}_H > 0 & \frac{1}{8}\,\mathrm{BPS} \\ \rho_1 = \rho_2 > \rho_3 = \rho_4 \geq 0 & \mathrm{Area}_H = 0 & \frac{1}{4}\,\mathrm{BPS} \\ \rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho_3 = \rho_4 \geq 0 & \mathrm{Area}_H = 0 & \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{BPS} \end{array} \tag{4.5.17}$$

The last column in table (4.5.17) is a prediction about the fraction of preserved supersymmetries that we shall verify in the next chapter.

Let us finally clarify the meaning of eq.(4.5.14) in comparison with our previous conclusion in statement 4.4.1 that at the horizon there is at most one non–vanishing central charge eigenvalue and that the horizon area is essentially the square of that eigenvalue (see eq.(4.4.9)). Superficially eq.s(4.5.14) and eq.(4.4.9) might seem to be contradictory, but it is not so.

Statement 4.5.2 *The numerical value of the horizon area is a* **topological** *quantity depending only on the vector of quantized charges $\vec{Q}$ that is also a group theoretical invariant of the U–duality group. This numerical value was named $S(p,q)$ since it is interpreted as the black hole entropy in black hole thermodynamics and its quantized charge dependence is given by eq.(4.5.6)*

By means of the construction described in the present section we have tried to reexpress the topological invariant $S(p,q)$ in terms of the central charges skew–eigenvalues Z_i. These latter depend on the scalar fields ϕ^I and therefore are not constant in space-time. In a black hole solution they have a radial dependence: $Z_i = Z_i(r)$ (see eq. (4.2.19)). However the combination of central charges we have constructed is such that its numerical value does not depend on the scalar fields. Hence eq.(4.5.14) is true at any point of space–time and expresses the value of the black–entropy in terms of the central charges skew eigenvalue evaluated at that point. Thus it happens that if we go to radial infinity $r = \infty$, by integrating the graviphoton field strength on a two sphere of very large radius we get, in principle, **5** different parameters, namely:

$$\rho_1^\infty \; \neq \; \rho_2^\infty \; \neq \; \rho_3^\infty \; \neq \; \rho_4^\infty \quad ; \quad \theta^\infty \tag{4.5.18}$$

On the other hand if we evaluate the central charges at the horizon, for a finite area black hole we find only one parameter:

$$\rho_1^H \neq 0 \quad ; \quad \rho_2^H = \rho_3^H = \rho_4^H = 0 \quad ; \quad \theta^H = 0 \tag{4.5.19}$$

Yet whether we use the parameters in eq.(4.5.18) or those in eq. (4.5.19) the topological invariant corresponding to the horizon area is always expressed by eq.(4.5.14) the numerical value being that provided by eq.(4.5.6). In particular we obtain the relation:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\rho_1^H\right)^2 &= (\rho_1^\infty + \rho_2^\infty + \rho_3^\infty + \rho_4^\infty)\,(\rho_1^\infty + \rho_2^\infty - \rho_3^\infty - \rho_4^\infty) \times \\ &\times (\rho_1^\infty - \rho_2^\infty + \rho_3^\infty - \rho_4^\infty)\,(\rho_1^\infty - \rho_2^\infty - \rho_3^\infty + \rho_4^\infty) \\ &+8\rho_1^\infty\,\rho_2^\infty\,\rho_3^\infty\,\rho_4^\infty\,(\cos\theta^\infty - 1)\end{aligned} \tag{4.5.20}$$

that applies to finite area $N = 8$ black holes. The **5** parameters parametrizing the central charge on a large 2–sphere depend, besides the quantized charges $\vec{Q}$, also on the *black hole moduli*, namely on the values:

$$\mu^I \equiv \phi^I(\infty) \tag{4.5.21}$$

attained by the scalar fields at radial infinity. These moduli are completely arbitrary. Yet the combination (4.5.14) of central charges is such that it actually depends only on the charges $\vec{Q}$ and not on the moduli. On the other hand, at the horizon the scalar fields flow to their fixed value that depends only on the charges and is insensitive to the boundary conditions at radial infinity.

The relevance of this discussion is that it puts into evidence that the 5 *moduli* characterizing the most general finite area $N = 8$ black hole can be parametrized by the skew eigenvalues of the central charge at radial infinity.

In the next chapter we address the problem of the explicit construction of $N = 8$ BPS black holes.

Chapter 5

N=8 supergravity: BPS black holes with 1/2, 1/4 and 1/8 of supersymmetry

5.1 Introduction to $N = 8$ BPS Black Holes

In this chapter we consider BPS extremal black–holes in the context of $N = 8$ supergravity.

$N = 8$ supergravity is the 4–dimensional effective lagrangian of both type IIA and type IIB superstrings compactified on a torus T^6. Alternatively it can be viewed as the $4D$ effective lagrangian of 11–dimensional M–theory compactified on a torus T^7. For this reason its U–duality group $E_{7(7)}(\mathbb{Z})$, which is defined as the discrete part of the isometry group of its scalar manifold:

$$\mathcal{M}_{scalar}^{(N=8)} = \frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}\,, \tag{5.1.1}$$

unifies all superstring dualities relating the various consistent superstring models. The *non perturbative BPS states* one needs to adjoin to the string states in order to complete linear representations of the U–duality group are, generically, *BPS black–holes*.

These latter can be viewed as intersections of several p–brane solutions of the higher dimensional theory *wrapped* on the homology cycles of the T^6 (or T^7) torus. Depending on how many p–branes intersect, the residual supersymmetry can be:

1. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the original supersymmetry
2. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the original supersymmetry
3. $\frac{1}{8}$ of the original supersymmetry

As we have already emphasized in section 3.1 and further discussed in chapter 4 the distinction between these three kinds of BPS solutions can be considered directly in a 4–dimensional setup and it is related to the structure of the central charge eigenvalues and to the behaviour of the scalar fields at the horizon. BPS black–holes with a finite horizon area are those for which the scalar fields are regular at the horizon and reach a fixed value there. These can only be the 1/8–type black holes, whose structure is that of $N = 2$ black–holes embedded into the $N = 8$

theory. For 1/2 and 1/4 black–holes the scalar fields always diverge at the horizon and the entropy is zero.

The nice point, in this respect, is that we can make a complete classification of all BPS black holes belonging to the three possible types. Indeed the distinction of the solutions into these three classes can be addressed a priori and, as we are going to see, corresponds to a classification into different orbits of the possible **56**–dimensional vectors $Q = \{p^\Lambda, q_\Sigma\}$ of magnetic-electric charges of the hole. Indeed $N = 8$ supergravity contains **28** gauge fields A^Λ_μ and correspondingly the hole can carry **28** magnetic p^Λ and **28** electric q_Σ charges. Through the symplectic embedding of the scalar manifold (5.1.1) it follows that the field strengths $F^\Lambda_{\mu\nu}$ plus their duals $G_{\Sigma|\mu\nu}$ transform in the fundamental **56** representation of $E_{7(7)}$ and the same is true of their integrals, namely the charges.

The Killing spinor equation (3.1.6) that imposes preservation of either 1/2, or 1/4, or 1/8 of the original supersymmetries enforces two consequences different in the three cases:

1. a different decomposition of the scalar field manifold into two sectors:
   - a sector of *dynamical scalar fields* that evolve in the radial parameter r
   - a sector of *spectator scalar fields* that do not evolve in r and are constant in the BPS solution.
2. a different orbit structure for the charge vector Q

Then, up to U–duality transformations, for each case one can write a fully general *generating solution* that contains the minimal necessary number of excited dynamical fields and the minimal necessary number of non vanishing charges. All other solutions of the same supersymmetry type can be obtained form the generating one by the action of $E_{7(7)}$–rotations.

Such an analysis is clearly group–theoretical and requires the use of appropriate techniques. The basic one is provided by the solvable Lie algebra representation of the scalar manifold.

5.2 Solvable Lie algebra description of the supergravity scalar manifold

As we already explained in chapter 3 it has been known for many years [38] that the scalar field manifold of both pure and matter coupled $N > 2$ extended supergravities in $D = 10 - r$ ($r = 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1$) is a non compact homogenous symmetric manifold $U_{(D,N)}/H_{(D,N)}$, where $U_{(D,N)}$ (depending on the space–time dimensions and on the number of supersymmetries) is a non compact Lie group and $H_{(D,N)} \subset U_{(D,N)}$ is a maximal compact subgroup. For instance in the physical $D = 4$ case the situation was summarized in table 3.1. In the case of maximally extended supergravities in $D = 10 - r$ dimensions the scalar manifold has a universal structure:

$$\frac{U_D}{H_D} = \frac{E_{r+1(r+1)}}{H_{r+1}} \tag{5.2.1}$$

where the Lie algebra of the U_D–group $E_{r+1(r+1)}$ is the maximally non compact real section of the exceptional E_{r+1} series of the simple complex Lie Algebras and H_{r+1} is its maximally compact subalgebra [39]. This series of homogeneous spaces is summarized in table 5.1.

$D=9$	$E_{2(2)} \equiv SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \otimes O(1,1)$	$H = O(2)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 3$
$D=8$	$E_{3(3)} \equiv SL(3,\mathbb{R}) \otimes Sl(2,\mathbb{R})$	$H = O(2) \otimes O(3)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 7$
$D=7$	$E_{4(4)} \equiv SL(5,\mathbb{R})$	$H = O(5)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 14$
$D=6$	$E_{5(5)} \equiv O(5,5)$	$H = O(5) \otimes O(5)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 25$
$D=5$	$E_{6(6)}$	$H = Usp(8)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 42$
$D=4$	$E_{7(7)}$	$H = SU(8)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 70$
$D=3$	$E_{8(8)}$	$H = O(16)$	$\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(U/H) = 128$

Table 5.1: U–duality groups and maximal compact subgroups of maximally extended supergravities.

All the homogeneous coset manifolds appearing in the various extended supergravity models share the very important property of being non–compact Riemannian manifolds $\mathcal{M}$ admitting a solvable Lie algebra description, i.e. they can be expressed as Lie group manifolds generated by a solvable Lie algebra $Solv$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \exp(Solv) \tag{5.2.2}$$

This property is of great relevance for the physical interpretation of supergravity since it allows an intrinsic algebraic characterization of the scalar fields of these theories which, without such a characterization, would simply be undistinguishable coordinates of a manifold. Furthermore the choice of the solvable parametrization provides essential technical advantages with respect to the choice of other parametrizations and plays a crucial role in the solution of BPS black hole equations. For this reason we devote the present section to explaining the basic features of such a solvable Lie algebra description of supergravity scalars.

5.2.1 Solvable Lie algebras: the machinery

Let us start by giving few preliminary definitions. A *solvable* Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}_s$ is a Lie algebra whose n^{th} order (for some $n \geq 1$) derivative algebra vanishes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{(n)}\mathbb{G}_s &= 0 \\ \mathcal{D}\mathbb{G}_s = [\mathbb{G}_s, \mathbb{G}_s] \quad &; \qquad \mathcal{D}^{(k+1)}\mathbb{G}_s = [\mathcal{D}^{(k)}\mathbb{G}_s, \mathcal{D}^{(k)}\mathbb{G}_s] \end{aligned}$$

A *metric* Lie algebra $(\mathbb{G}, h)$ is a Lie algebra endowed with an euclidean metric h. An important theorem states that if a Riemannian manifold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ admits a transitive group of isometries $\mathcal{G}_s$ generated by a solvable Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}_s$ of the same dimension as $\mathcal{M}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} \sim \mathcal{G}_s &= \exp(\mathbb{G}_s) \\ g_{|e\in\mathcal{M}} &= h \end{aligned}$$

where h is an euclidean metric defined on $\mathbb{G}_s$. Therefore there is a one to one correspondence between Riemannian manifolds fulfilling the hypothesis stated above and solvable metric Lie algebras $(\mathbb{G}_s, h)$.
Consider now a homogeneous coset manifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{G}$ being a non compact real form of a semisimple Lie group and $\mathcal{H}$ its maximal compact subgroup. If $\mathbb{G}$ is the Lie algebra generating $\mathcal{G}$,

the so called Iwasawa decomposition ensures the existence of a solvable Lie subalgebra $\mathbb{G}_s \subset \mathbb{G}$, acting transitively on $\mathcal{M}$, such that [40]:

$$\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H} + \mathbb{G}_s \qquad \dim \mathbb{G}_s = \dim \mathcal{M} \tag{5.2.3}$$

$\mathbb{H}$ being the maximal compact subalgebra of $\mathbb{G}$ generating $\mathcal{H}$. Note that the sum (5.2.3) is not required to be an orthogonal decomposition, namely the elements of $\mathbb{G}_s$ are not requested to be orthogonal to the elements of $\mathbb{H}$ but simply linearly independent from them.
In virtue of the previously stated theorem, $\mathcal{M}$ may be expressed as a solvable group manifold generated by $\mathbb{G}_s$. The algebra $\mathbb{G}_s$ is constructed as follows [40]. Consider the Cartan orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{K} \tag{5.2.4}$$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{H}_K$ the maximal abelian subspace of $\mathbb{K}$ and by $\mathcal{H}$ the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathbb{G}$. It can be proven [40] that $\mathcal{H}_K = \mathcal{H} \cap \mathbb{K}$, that is it consists of all non compact elements of $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore let h_{α_i} denote the elements of $\mathcal{H}_K$, $\{\alpha_i\}$ being a subset of the positive roots of $\mathbb{G}$ and Φ^+ the set of positive roots β not orthogonal to all the α_i (i.e. the corresponding "shift" operators E_β do not commute with $\mathcal{H}_K$). It can be demonstrated that the solvable algebra $\mathbb{G}_s$ defined by the Iwasawa decomposition may be expressed in the following way:

$$\mathbb{G}_s = \mathcal{H}_K \oplus \{ \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} E_\alpha \cap \mathbb{G} \} \tag{5.2.5}$$

where the intersection with $\mathbb{G}$ means that $\mathbb{G}_s$ is generated by those suitable complex combinations of the "shift" operators which belong to the real form of the isometry algebra $\mathbb{G}$.

The *rank* of a homogeneous coset manifold is defined as the maximum number of commuting semisimple elements of the non compact subspace $\mathbb{K}$. Therefore it coincides with the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_K$, i.e. the number of non compact Cartan generators of $\mathbb{G}$. A coset manifold is *maximally non compact* if $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_K \subset \mathbb{G}_s$. The relevance of maximally non compact coset manifolds relies on the fact that they are spanned by the scalar fields in the maximally extended supergravity theories. In the solvable representation of a manifold the local coordinates of the manifold are the parameters of the generating Lie algebra, therefore adopting this parametrization of scalar manifolds in supergravity implies the definition of a one to one correspondence between the scalar fields and the generators of $Solv$ [41, 42].

Special Kähler manifolds and Quaternionic manifolds admitting such a description have been classified in the 70's by Alekseevskii [43].

5.2.2 Solvable Lie algebras: the simplest example

The simplest example of solvable Lie algebra parametrization is the case of the two dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M} = SL(2,\mathbb{R})/SO(2)$ which may be described as the exponential of the following solvable Lie algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} SL(2,\mathbb{R})/SO(2) &= \exp\left(Solv\right) \\ Solv &= \{\sigma_3, \sigma_+\} \\ [\sigma_3, \sigma_+] &= 2\sigma_+ \\ \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad &; \quad \sigma_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.6}$$

From (5.2.6) we can see a general feature of $Solv$, i.e. it may always be expressed as the direct sum of semisimple (the non–compact Cartan generators of the isometry group) and nilpotent generators, which in a suitable basis are represented respectively by diagonal and upper triangular matrices. This property, as we shall see, is one of the advantages of the solvable Lie algebra description since it allows to express the coset representative of a homogeneous manifold as a solvable group element which is the product of a diagonal matrix and the exponential of a nilpotent matrix, which is a polynomial in the parameters. The simple solvable algebra represented in (5.2.6) is called *key* algebra and will be denoted by F.

5.2.3 Another example: the solvable Lie algebra of the STU model

As a second example we illustrate the solvable Lie algebra parametrization of a coset manifold that will play a crucial role in the discussion of 1/8 preserving BPS black holes. The coset manifold we refer to is an instance of special Kähler homogeneous manifold, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{ST}[2,2] &= \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SO(2,2)}{SO(2)\times SO(2)} \\ &\sim \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \\ &\sim \left(\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{SO(2)}\right)^3 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.7}$$

This is the scalar manifold of an $N = 2$ supergravity theory containing three vector multiplets. The corresponding three complex scalar fields are usually named S, T and U and for this reason such a model is named the STU model. Hence the scalar manifold of the STU model is a special Kähler manifold generated by a solvable Lie algebra which is the sum of 3 commuting key algebras:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{STU} &= \left(\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{SO(2)}\right)^3 = \exp\left(Solv_{STU}\right) \\ Solv_{STU} &= F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3 \\ F_i = \{h_i, g_i\} \quad &; \quad [h_i, g_i] = 2g_i \\ [F_i, F_j] &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.8}$$

the parameters of the Cartan generators h_i are the dilatons of the theory, while the parameters of the nilpotent generators g_i are the axions. The three $SO(2)$ isotropy groups of the manifold are generated by the three compact generators $\widetilde{g}_i = g_i - g_i^\dagger$.

5.2.4 A third example: solvable Lie algebra description of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$

If we compactify the type IIA superstring on the orbifold of a six–torus modulo some discrete group we obtain a low energy effective supergravity that corresponds to a truncation of the original $N = 8$ supergravity, generally with lower supersymmetry. For instance if the six extra dimensions are compactified on the orbifold $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3$, the resulting theory is $N = 2$ supergravity coupled to **9** vector multiplets. The 18 scalars belonging to these vector multiplets are the

coordinates of a special Kähler manifold that we name $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$ since it can be geometrically interpreted as the moduli space of Kähler class deformations of the orbifold. This space is one of the exceptional special Kähler homogeneous spaces of the Cremmer Van Proeyen classification: indeed it is $SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$ (see table (3.2)). It plays an important role in deriving the *generating solution* of BPS black holes of the 1/8 type. For this reason we anticipate here its solvable Lie algebra description as an illustration of the general theory by means of a third example. We find that this 18–dimensional Special Kähler manifold is generated by a solvable algebra whose structure is slightly more involved than that considered in the previous example, indeed it contains the solvable Lie algebra of the STU model plus some additional nilpotent generators. Explicitly we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3} &= \frac{SU(3,3)}{SU(3)\times U(3)} = \exp\left(Solv\right) \\ Solv &= Solv_{STU} \oplus \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \oplus \mathbf{Z} \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.9}$$

The 4 dimensional subspaces $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}$ consist of nilpotent generators, while the only semisimple generators are the 3 Cartan generators contained in $Solv_{STU}$ which define the rank of the manifold. The algebraic structure of $Solv$ together with the details of the construction of the $SU(3,3)$ generators in the representation **20** is what we explain next. This corresponds to the explicit construction of the symplectic embedding of the coset manifold implied by special geometry. Such a construction will be particularly relevant to the construction of the 1/8 supersymmetry preserving black–holes. Indeed the **20** dimensional representation of $SU(3,3)$ is that which accommodates the $\mathbf{10} \oplus \mathbf{10}$ electric plus magnetic field strengths of $N = 2$ supergravity coupled to **9** vector multiplets. In a first step we shall argue that the $N = 8$ black–holes of type 1/8 are actually solutions of such an $N = 2$ theory embedded into the $N = 8$ one. In a second step we shall even argue that the *generating solution* is actually a solution of a further truncation of this $N = 2$ theory to an STU–model.

Anticipating these physical motivations, in describing the solvable Lie algebra structure of the $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$ manifold we pay particular attention to how it incorporates the STU solvable algebra. Indeed applying the decomposition (5.2.5) to the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$ one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} SU(3,3) &= [SU(3)_1 \oplus SU(3)_2 \oplus U(1)] \oplus Solv \\ Solv &= F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3 \oplus \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \oplus \mathbf{Z} \\ F_i &= \{\mathrm{h}_i\,,\,\mathrm{g}_i\} \quad i = 1,2,3 \\ \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}^+ \oplus \mathbf{X}^-\,,\ \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{Y}^+ \oplus \mathbf{Y}^-\,,\ \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}^+ \oplus \mathbf{Z}^- \\ [\mathrm{h}_i\,,\,\mathrm{g}_i] &= 2\mathrm{g}_i \quad i = 1,2,3 \\ [F_i\,,\,F_j] &= 0 \quad i \neq j \\ [\mathrm{h}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^\pm] &= \pm\mathbf{Y}^\pm\,,\ [\mathrm{h}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^\pm] = \pm\mathbf{X}^\pm \\ [\mathrm{h}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^\pm] &= \pm\mathbf{Z}^\pm\,,\ [\mathrm{h}_2\,,\,\mathbf{X}^\pm] = \mathbf{X}^\pm \\ [\mathrm{h}_1\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^\pm] &= \mathbf{Z}^\pm\,,\ [\mathrm{h}_1\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^\pm] = \mathbf{Y}^\pm \\ [\mathrm{g}_1\,,\,\mathbf{X}] &= [\mathrm{g}_1\,,\,\mathbf{Y}] = [\mathrm{g}_1\,,\,\mathbf{Z}] = 0 \\ [\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{X}] &= [\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Y}] = [\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^+] = 0\,,\ [\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^-] = \mathbf{Z}^+ \\ [\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^+] &= [\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^+] = [\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Z}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^-\right] &= \mathbf{Y}^+;\ \left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^-\right] = \mathbf{X}^+ \\
\left[F_1\,,\,\mathbf{X}\right] &= \left[F_2\,,\,\mathbf{Y}\right] = \left[F_3\,,\,\mathbf{Z}\right] = 0 \\
\left[\mathbf{X}^-\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^-\right] &= \mathbf{Y}^-
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2.10}
$$

where the solvable subalgebra $Solv_{STU} = F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3$ is the solvable algebra generating $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$. Denoting by α_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 5$ the simple roots of $SU(3,3)$, using the *canonical* basis for the $SU(3,3)$ algebra, the generators in (5.2.10) have the following form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{h}_1 &= H_{\alpha_1} \quad \mathrm{g}_1 = \mathrm{i}E_{\alpha_1} \\
\mathrm{h}_2 &= H_{\alpha_3} \quad \mathrm{g}_2 = \mathrm{i}E_{\alpha_3} \\
\mathrm{h}_3 &= H_{\alpha_5} \quad \mathrm{g}_3 = \mathrm{i}E_{\alpha_5} \\
\mathbf{X}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^+_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{-\alpha_4} + E_{\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5}) \\ \mathbf{X}^+_2 = E_{\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5} - E_{-\alpha_4} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{X}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^-_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{\alpha_3+\alpha_4} + E_{-(\alpha_4+\alpha_5)}) \\ \mathbf{X}^-_2 = E_{\alpha_3+\alpha_4} - E_{-(\alpha_4+\alpha_5)} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{Y}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y}^+_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5} + E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)}) \\ \mathbf{Y}^+_2 = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5} - E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4)} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{Y}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y}^-_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4} + E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5)}) \\ \mathbf{Y}^-_2 = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4} - E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_4+\alpha_5)} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{Z}^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^+_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3} + E_{-\alpha_2}) \\ \mathbf{Z}^+_2 = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_3} - E_{-\alpha_2} \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{Z}^- &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^-_1 = \mathrm{i}(E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} + E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3)}) \\ \mathbf{Z}^-_2 = E_{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} - E_{-(\alpha_2+\alpha_3)} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2.11}
$$

As far as the embedding of the isotropy group $SO(2)^3$ of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ inside the $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/Z_3}$ isotropy group $SU(3)_1 \times SU(3)_2 \times U(1)$ is concerned, the 3 generators of the former ($\{\widetilde{g}_1, \widetilde{g}_2, \widetilde{g}_3\}$) are related to the Cartan generators of the latter in the following way:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{g}_1 &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\left(H_{c_1} - H_{d_1} + H_{c_1+c_2} - H_{d_1+d_2}\right)\right) \\
\widetilde{g}_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\left(H_{c_1} - H_{d_1} - 2(H_{c_1+c_2} - H_{d_1+d_2})\right)\right) \\
\widetilde{g}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\left(-2(H_{c_1} - H_{d_1}) + (H_{c_1+c_2} - H_{d_1+d_2})\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2.12}
$$

where $\{c_i\}, \{d_i\}$, $i = 1, 2$ are the simple roots of $SU(3)_1$ and $SU(3)_2$ respectively, while λ is the generator of $U(1)$.

In order to perform the truncation to an STU model, one needs to know also which of the $\mathbf{10} + \mathbf{10}$ field strengths should be set to zero in order to be left with the $\mathbf{4} + \mathbf{4}$ of STU model. This information is provided by the decomposition of the $\mathbf{20}$ of $SU(3,3)$ with respect to the isometry group of the STU model, namely $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$:

$$
\mathbf{20} \overset{SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3}{\rightarrow} (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) \oplus 2 \times [(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})]
\tag{5.2.13}
$$

Then, skew diagonalizing the 5 Cartan generators of $SU(3)_1 \times SU(3)_2 \times U(1)$ on the **20** we obtain the 10 positive weights of the representation as 5 components vectors $\vec{v}^{\Lambda'}$ ($\Lambda' = 0, \ldots, 9$):

$$\begin{aligned} \{C(n)\} &= \{\frac{H_{c_1}}{2}, \frac{H_{c_1+c_2}}{2}, \frac{H_{d_1}}{2}, \frac{H_{d_1+d_2}}{2}, \lambda\} \\ C(n) \cdot |v_x^{\Lambda'}\rangle &= v_{(n)}^{\Lambda'} |v_y^{\Lambda'}\rangle \\ C(n) \cdot |v_y^{\Lambda'}\rangle &= -v_{(n)}^{\Lambda'} |v_x^{\Lambda'}\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.14}$$

Using the relation (5.2.12) we compute the value of the weights $v^{\Lambda'}$ on the three generators $\widetilde{g}_i$ and find out which are the 4 positive weights $\vec{v}^{\Lambda}$ ($\Lambda = 0, \ldots, 3$) of the $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$ in (5.2.13). The complete list of weights $\vec{v}^{\Lambda'}$ and their eigenvectors $|v_{x,y}^{\Lambda'}\rangle$ are worked out below.

Evaluated on the Cartan subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$ of $SU(3)_1 \oplus SU(3)_2 \oplus U(1)$ the weights $\vec{v}^{\Lambda'}$ read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{v}^{\Lambda'} &= v^{\Lambda'}(\frac{H_{c_1}}{2}, \frac{H_{c_1+c_2}}{2}, \frac{H_{d_1}}{2}, \frac{H_{d_1+d_2}}{2}, \lambda) \\ v^0 &= \{0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{3}{2}\} \\ v^1 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^2 &= \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^3 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^4 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^5 &= \{0, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^6 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^7 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, -\frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^8 &= \{0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\} \\ v^9 &= \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\} \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.15}$$

The weights (5.2.15) have been ordered in such a way that the first four define the $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$ of the subgroup $SL(2, \mathbb{R})^3 \subset SU(3,3)$ and in the physical interpretation of this algebraic construction the weight $\vec{v}^0$ will be associated with the graviphoton since its restriction to the Cartan generators $H_{c_1}, H_{c_1+c_2}, H_{d_1}, H_{d_1+d_2}$ of the matter isotropy group $H_{matter} = SU(3)_1 \oplus SU(3)_2$ is trivial.

As promised, while constructing the $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3}$ we have completely defined the way it incorporates the STU model. Indeed we obtained an algebraic recipe to perform the truncation to the STU model: setting to zero all the scalars parametrizing the 12 generators $\mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \oplus \mathbf{Z}$ in (5.2.9) and the 6 vector fields corresponding to the weights $v^{\Lambda'}$, $\Lambda' = 4, \ldots, 9$. Restricting the action of

the $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ generators $(h_i, g_i, \widetilde{g}_i)$ inside $SU(3,3)$ to the 8 eigenvectors $|v^{\Lambda}_{x,y}\rangle(\Lambda = 0,\ldots,3)$ the embedding of $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ in $Sp(8)$ is automatically obtained [1].

After performing the restriction to the $Sp(8)_D$ representation of $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ we have just described, the orthonormal basis $|v^{\Lambda}_{x,y}\rangle$ $(\Lambda = 0,1,2,3)$ is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
|v^1_x\rangle &= \{0,0,0,0,\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}\} \\
|v^2_x\rangle &= \{0,0,0,0,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}\} \\
|v^3_x\rangle &= \{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},0,0,0,0\} \\
|v^4_x\rangle &= \{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},0,0,0,0\} \\
|v^1_y\rangle &= \{\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},0,0,0,0\} \\
|v^2_y\rangle &= \{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0,0,0,0\} \\
|v^3_y\rangle &= \{0,0,0,0,-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}\} \\
|v^4_y\rangle &= \{0,0,0,0,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2.16}
$$

The $Sp(8)_D$ representation of the generators of $Solv_{STU}$ reads as:

$$
h_1 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad g_1 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
h_2 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad g_2 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

[1] In the $Sp(8)$ representation of the U–duality group $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ we shall use the non–compact Cartan generators h_i are diagonal. Such a representation will be denoted by $Sp(8)_D$, where the subscript "D" stands for "Dynkin". This notation has been introduced in [44] to distinguish the representation $Sp(8)_D$ from $Sp(8)_Y$ ("Y" standing for "Young") where on the contrary the Cartan generators of the compact isotropy group (in our case $\widetilde{g}_i$) are diagonal. The two representations are related by an orthogonal transformation.

$$h_3 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad g_3 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

5.2.5 Solvable Lie algebras: R-R and NS-NS scalars in maximally extended supergravities

At the beginning of this section we stated that every non compact homogeneous space $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ is actually a solvable group manifold and that its generating solvable Lie algebra $Solv\,(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H})$ can be constructed utilizing roots and Dynkin diagram techniques. As we stressed this is important in string theory since it offers the possibility of introducing an intrinsic algebraic characterization of the supergravity scalars. In particular this yields a group–theoretical definition of Ramond–Ramond and Neveu–Schwarz scalars. It goes as follows. The same supergravity lagrangian admits different interpretations as low energy theory of different superstrings related by duality transformations or of M–theory. The identification of the Ramond and Neveu Schwarz sectors is different in the different interpretations. Algebraically this corresponds to inequivalent decompositions of the solvable Lie algebra $Solv\,(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H})$ with respect to different subalgebras. Each string theory admits a T–duality and an S–duality group whose product $S \otimes T$ constitutes a subgroup of the U–duality group, namely of the isometry group $U \equiv \mathcal{G}$ of the homogeneous scalar manifold $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$. Physically S is a non perturbative symmetry acting on the *dilaton* while T is a perturbative symmetry acting on the "*radii*" of the compactification. There exist also two compact subgroups $\mathcal{H}_S \subset S$ and $\mathcal{H}_T \subset T$ whose product $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_T \subset H$ is contained in the maximal compact subgroup $\mathcal{H} \subset U$ such that we can write:

$$Solv\,(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{H}) = Solv\,(S/\mathcal{H}_S) \oplus Solv\,(T/\mathcal{H}_T) \oplus \mathcal{W} \tag{5.2.17}$$

the three addends being all subalgebras of $Solv\,(\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{H})$. The first two addends constitute the Neveu Schwarz sector while the last subalgebra $\mathcal{W}$ which is not only solvable but also *nilpotent* constitutes the Ramond sector relative to the chosen superstring interpretation.

An example of this way of reasoning is provided by maximal supergravities in $D = 10 - r$ dimensions. For such lagrangians the scalar sector is given by $\mathcal{M}_{scalar} = E_{r+1(r+1)}/\mathcal{H}_{r+1}$ where the group $E_{r+1(r+1)}$ is obtained exponentiating the maximally non compact real form of the exceptional rank $r+1$ Lie algebra E_{r+1} and $\mathcal{H}_{r+1}$ is the corresponding maximal compact subgroup (see table 5.1). If we interpret supergravity as the low energy theory of Type IIA superstring compactified on a torus T^r, then the appropriate S-duality group is $O(1,1)$ and the appropriate T–duality group is $SO(r,r)$. Correspondingly we obtain the decomposition:

$$Solv\left(E_{r+1(r+1)}/\mathcal{H}_{r+1}\right) = O(1,1) \oplus Solv\left(\frac{SO(r,r)}{SO(r)\times SO(r)}\right) \oplus \mathcal{W}_{n_{r+1}} \tag{5.2.18}$$

where the Ramond subalgebra $\mathcal{W}_{n_{r+1}} \equiv spin[r,r]$ is nothing else but the chiral spinor representation of $SO(r,r)$. In the four dimensional case $r = 6$ equation (5.2.18) takes the exceptional

form:

$$Solv\left(\frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}\right) = Solv\left(\frac{SL(2,R)}{O(2)}\right) \oplus Solv\left(\frac{SO(6,6)}{SO(6)\times SO(6)}\right) \oplus \mathcal{W}_{32} \tag{5.2.19}$$

The 38 Neveu Schwarz scalars are given by the first two addends in (5.2.19), while the 32 Ramond scalars in the algebra $\mathcal{W}_{32}$ transform in the spinor representation of $SO(6,6)$ as in all the other cases.

Alternatively we can interpret maximal supergravity in $D = 10 - r$ as the compactification on a torus T^r of Type IIB superstring. In this case the ST–duality group is different. We just have:

$$S \otimes T \;=\; O(1,1) \otimes GL(r) \tag{5.2.20}$$

Correspondingly we write the solvable Lie algebra decomposition:

$$Solv\left(E_{r+1(r+1)}/\mathcal{H}_{r+1}\right) = O(1,1) \oplus Solv\left(\frac{GL(r)}{SO(r)}\right) \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{n_{r+1}} \tag{5.2.21}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{r+1}$ is the new algebra of Ramond scalars with respect to the Type IIB interpretation. Actually, as it is well known, Type IIB theory already admits an $SL(2,R)$ U–duality symmetry in ten dimensions that mixes Ramond and Neveu Schwarz states. The proper S–duality group $O(1,1)$ is just a maximal subgroup of such $SL(2,R)$. Correspondingly eq. (5.2.21) can be restated as:

$$Solv_{r+1} \;\equiv\; Solv\left(E_{r+1(r+1)}/\mathcal{H}_{r+1}\right) = Solv\left(SL(2,R)/O(2)\right) \oplus Solv\left(\frac{GL(r)}{SO(r)}\right) \oplus \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{n_{r+1}} \tag{5.2.22}$$

Finally a third decomposition of the same solvable Lie algebra can be written if the same supergravity lagrangian is interpreted as compactification on a torus T^7 of M–theory. For the details on this and other decompositions of the scalar sector that keep track of the sequential compactifications on multiple torii we refer the reader to the original papers [41, 42].

5.3 Summary of $N = 8$ supergravity.

Having reviewed the solvable Lie algebra description of the supergravity scalar manifolds we next proceed to summarize the structure of $N = 8$ supergravity. The action is of the general form (3.1.21) with g_{IJ} being the invariant metric of $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$ and the period matrix $\mathcal{N}$ being determined from the Gaillard Zumino master formula (3.3.17) via the appropriate symplectic embedding of $E_{7(7)}$ into $Sp(56,\mathbb{R})$ (see table 3.1). Hence, according to the general formalism discussed in chapter 4 and to eq.(4.2.2) we introduce the coset representative $\mathbb{L}$ of $\frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}$ in the **56** representation of $E_{7(7)}$:

$$\mathbb{L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} f + \mathrm{i}h & \overline{f} + \mathrm{i}\overline{h} \\ \hline f - \mathrm{i}h & \overline{f} - \mathrm{i}\overline{h} \end{array}\right) \tag{5.3.1}$$

where the submatrices (h, f) are 28×28 matrices labeled by antisymmetric pairs Λ, Σ, A, B ($\Lambda, \Sigma = 1, \ldots, 8,\ A, B = 1, \ldots, 8$) the first pair transforming under $E_{7(7)}$ and the second one under $SU\,(8)$:

$$(h, f) = \left(h_{\Lambda\Sigma|AB}, f^{\Lambda\Sigma}{}_{AB}\right) \tag{5.3.2}$$

As expected from the general formalism we have $\mathbb{L} \in Usp(28,28)$. The vielbein P_{ABCD} and the $SU(8)$ connection $\Omega_A^{\ B}$ of $\frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}$ are computed from the left invariant 1-form $\mathbb{L}^{-1}d\mathbb{L}$:

$$\mathbb{L}^{-1}d\mathbb{L} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \delta^{[A}_{\ [C}\Omega^{B]}_{\ \ D]} & \overline{P}^{ABCD} \\ \hline P_{ABCD} & \delta_{[A}^{\ \ [C}\overline{\Omega}_{B]}^{\ \ D]} \end{array}\right) \tag{5.3.3}$$

where $P_{ABCD} \equiv P_{ABCD,i}d\Phi^i \quad (i = 1,\ldots,70)$ is completely antisymmetric and satisfies the reality condition

$$P_{ABCD} = \frac{1}{24}\epsilon_{ABCDEFGH}\overline{P}^{EFGH} \tag{5.3.4}$$

The bosonic lagrangian of $N = 8$ supergravity is [39]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \int \sqrt{-g}\, d^4x \left(2R + \mathrm{Im}\ \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}F_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \Lambda\Sigma}F^{\Gamma\Delta|\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{6}P_{ABCD,i}\overline{P}_j^{ABCD}\partial_\mu\Phi^i\partial^\mu\Phi^j + \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Re}\ \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}\frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}}{\sqrt{-g}}F_{\mu\nu}^{\ \ \Lambda\Sigma}F^{\Gamma\Delta}_{\ \ \rho\sigma}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{5.3.5}$$

where the curvature two-form is defined as

$$R^{ab} = d\omega^{ab} - \omega^a_{\ c} \wedge \omega^{cb}. \tag{5.3.6}$$

and the kinetic matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}$ is given by the usual general formula:

$$\mathcal{N} = hf^{-1} \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta} = h_{\Lambda\Sigma|AB}f^{-1\ AB}_{\ \ \ \Gamma\Delta}. \tag{5.3.7}$$

The same matrix relates the (anti)self-dual electric and magnetic 2-form field strengths, namely, setting

$$F^{\pm\ \Lambda\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\left(F \pm \mathrm{i}\ \star F\right)^{\Lambda\Sigma} \tag{5.3.8}$$

according to the general formulae (3.2.22) one has

$$\begin{aligned} G^-_{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}F^{-\ \Gamma\Delta} \\ G^+_{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}F^{+\ \Gamma\Delta} \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.9}$$

where the "dual" field strengths $G^\pm_{\Lambda\Sigma}$, according to the general formalism (see eq.(3.2.12)) are defined as $G^\pm_{\Lambda\Sigma} = \frac{i}{2}\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta F^{\pm\ \Lambda\Sigma}}$. Note that the 56 dimensional (anti)self-dual vector $\left(F^{\pm\ \Lambda\Sigma}, G^\pm_{\Lambda\Sigma}\right)$ transforms covariantly under $U \in Sp(56,\mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} &U\begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F' \\ G' \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \\ &A^tC - C^tA = 0 \\ &B^tD - D^tB = 0 \\ &A^tD - C^tB = \mathbf{1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.10}$$

The matrix transforming the coset representative $\mathbb{L}$ from the $Usp\,(28,28)$ basis, eq.(5.3.1), to the real $Sp\,(56,\mathbb{R})$ basis is the Cayley matrix:

$$\mathbb{L}_{Usp} = \mathcal{C}\mathbb{L}_{Sp}\mathcal{C}^{-1} \qquad \mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & \mathrm{i}\mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & -\mathrm{i}\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.3.11}$$

implying eq.s(4.2.3). Having established our definitions and notations, let us now write down the Killing spinor equations obtained by equating to zero the SUSY transformation laws of the gravitino $\psi_{A\mu}$ and dilatino χ_{ABC} fields of $N=8$ supergravity in a purely bosonic background:

$$\delta\chi_{ABC} = 4\mathrm{i}\; P_{ABCD|i}\partial_\mu\Phi^i\gamma^\mu\epsilon^D - 3T^{(-)}_{[AB|\rho\sigma}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\epsilon_{C]} = 0 \tag{5.3.12}$$

$$\delta\psi_{A\mu} = \nabla_\mu\epsilon_A - \frac{1}{4}\,T^{(-)}_{AB|\rho\sigma}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\gamma_\mu\epsilon^B = 0 \tag{5.3.13}$$

where ∇_μ denotes the derivative covariant both with respect to Lorentz and $SU\,(8)$ local transformations

$$\nabla_\mu\epsilon_A = \partial_\mu\epsilon_A - \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}\,\omega^{ab}\epsilon_A - \Omega_A{}^B\epsilon_B \tag{5.3.14}$$

and where $T^{(-)}_{AB}$ is the "dressed graviphoton"2−form, defined according to the general formulae (4.2.16)

$$T^{(-)}_{AB} = \left(h_{\Lambda\Sigma AB}\,(\Phi)\,F^{-\Lambda\Sigma} - f^{\Lambda\Sigma}_{AB}\,(\Phi)\,G^-_{\Lambda\Sigma}\right) \tag{5.3.15}$$

From equations (5.3.7), (5.3.9) we have the following identities that are the particular $N=8$ instance of eq.(4.2.17):

$$T^+_{AB} = 0 \rightarrow T^-_{AB} = T_{AB} \qquad \overline{T}^-_{AB} = 0 \rightarrow \overline{T}^+_{AB} = \overline{T}_{AB}$$

Following the general procedure indicated by eq.(4.2.19) we can define the central charge:

$$Z_{AB} = \int_{S^2} T_{AB} = h_{\Lambda\Sigma|AB}p^{\Lambda\Sigma} - f^{\Lambda\Sigma}_{AB}q_{\Lambda\Sigma} \tag{5.3.16}$$

which in our case is an antisymmetric tensor transforming in the **28** irreducible representation of $SU(8)$. In eq.(5.3.16) the integral of the two-form T_{AB} is evaluated on a large two-sphere at infinity and the quantized charges $(p_{\Lambda\Sigma},\ q^{\Lambda\Sigma})$ are defined, following the general eq.s (4.2.21) by

$$\begin{aligned} p^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \int_{S^2} F^{\Lambda\Sigma} \\ q_{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \int_{S^2} \mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}\star F^{\Gamma\Delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.17}$$

5.4 The Killing spinor equation and its covariance group

In order to translate eq.(5.3.12) and (5.3.13) into first order differential equations on the bosonic fields of supergravity we consider a configuration where all the fermionic fields are zero and a SUSY parameter that satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^\mu\,\gamma_\mu\,\epsilon_A &= \mathrm{i}\mathbb{C}_{AB}\,\epsilon^B \quad ; \quad A,B = 1,\ldots,n_{max} \\ \epsilon_A &= 0 \quad ; \quad A > n_{max} \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.1}$$

Here χ^μ is a time–like Killing vector for the space–time metric (in the following we just write $\chi^\mu\gamma_\mu = \gamma^0$) and ϵ_A, ϵ^A denote the two chiral projections of a single Majorana spinor: $\gamma_5\,\epsilon_A = \epsilon_A$, $\gamma_5\,\epsilon^A = -\epsilon^A$. This is just the particularization to the $N = 8$ case of eq.s (3.1.5) defining the Killing spinor ξ_A and inserting an ϵ_A with the properties (5.4.1) into eq.s (5.3.12),(5.3.13) we obtain the $N = 8$ instance of the general equation (3.1.6). We name such an equation the *Killing spinor equation* and the investigation of its group–theoretical structure is the main task we face in order to derive the three possible types of BPS black–holes, those preserving 1/2 or 1/4 or 1/8 of the original supersymmetry. To appreciate the distinction among the three types of $N = 8$ black–hole solutions we need to recall the results of [47] where a classification was given of the **56**–vectors of quantized electric and magnetic charges $\vec{Q}$ characterizing such solutions. The basic argument is provided by the reduction of the central charge skew–symmetric tensor $\mathbb{Z}_{AB}$ to normal form. The reduction can always be obtained by means of local $SU(8)$ transformations, but the structure of the skew eigenvalues depends on the orbit–type of the **56**–dimensional charge vector which can be described by means of its stabilizer subgroup $G_{stab}(\vec{Q}) \subset E_{7(7)}$:

$$g \in G_{stab}(\vec{Q}) \subset E_{7(7)} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad g\,\vec{Q} = \vec{Q} \tag{5.4.2}$$

There are three possibilities:

SUSY	Central Charge	Stabilizer $\equiv G_{stab}$	Normalizer $\equiv G_{norm}$
1/2	$Z_1 = Z_2 = Z_3 = Z_4$	$E_{6(6)}$	$O(1,1)$
1/4	$Z_1 = Z_2 \neq Z_3 = Z_4$	$SO(5,5)$	$SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1)$
1/8	$Z_1 \neq Z_2 \neq Z_3 \neq Z_4$	$SO(4,4)$	$SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$

(5.4.3)

where the normalizer $G_{norm}(\vec{Q})$ is defined as the subgroup of $E_{7(7)}$ that commutes with the stabilizer:

$$[G_{norm}\,,\,G_{stab}] = 0 \tag{5.4.4}$$

The main result of [44] is that the most general 1/8 black–hole solution of $N = 8$ supergravity is related to the normalizer group $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$. In the subsequent paper [45] the 1/2 and 1/4 cases were completely worked out. Finally in [46] the explicit form of the generating solutions was discussed for the 1/8 case. In these lectures we review all these results in detailed form.

In all three cases the Killing spinor equation has two features which we want presently to stress:

1. It requires an efficient parametrization of the scalar field sector
2. It breaks the original $SU(8)$ automorphism group of the supersymmetry algebra to the subgroup $Usp(2\,n_{max}) \times SU(8 - 2\,n_{max}) \times U(1)$

The first feature is the reason why the use of the rank 7 solvable Lie algebra $Solv_7$ associated with $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$ is of great help in this problem. The second feature is the reason why the

solvable Lie algebra $Solv_7$ has to be decomposed in a way appropriate to the decomposition of the isotropy group $SU(8)$ with respect to the subgroup $Usp(2\,n_{max}) \times SU(8-2\,n_{max}) \times U(1)$.

This decomposition of the solvable Lie algebra is a close relative of the decomposition of $N = 8$ supergravity into multiplets of the lower supersymmetry $N' = 2\,n_{max}$. This is easily understood by recalling that close to the horizon of the black hole one doubles the supersymmetries holding in the bulk of the solution. Hence the near horizon supersymmetry is precisely $N' = 2\,n_{max}$ and the black solution can be interpreted as a soliton that interpolates between *ungauged* $N = 8$ supergravity at infinity and some form of N' supergravity at the horizon.

The 1/2 SUSY case

Here we have $n_{max} = 8$ and correspondingly the covariance subgroup of the Killing spinor equation is $Usp(8) \subset SU(8)$. Indeed condition (5.4.1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\gamma^0\,\epsilon_A = \mathrm{i}\,\mathbb{C}_{AB}\,\epsilon^B \quad ; \quad A, B = 1, \ldots, 8 \tag{5.4.5}$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{AB} = -\mathbb{C}_{BA}$ denotes an 8×8 antisymmetric matrix satisfying $\mathbb{C}^2 = -\mathbb{1}$. The group $Usp(8)$ is the subgroup of unimodular, unitary 8×8 matrices that are also symplectic, namely that preserve the matrix $\mathbb{C}$. Relying on eq. (5.4.3) we see that in the present case $G_{stab} = E_{6(6)}$ and $G_{norm} = O(1,1)$. Furthermore we have the following decomposition of the **70** irreducible representation of $SU(8)$ into irreducible representations of $Usp(8)$:

$$\mathbf{70} \overset{Usp(8)}{\longrightarrow} \mathbf{42} \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{27} \tag{5.4.6}$$

We are accordingly lead to decompose the solvable Lie algebra as

$$Solv_7 = Solv_6 \oplus O(1,1) \oplus \mathbb{D}_6 \tag{5.4.7}$$

$$70 = 42 + 1 + 27 \tag{5.4.8}$$

where, following the notation established in [44, 41]:

$$\begin{aligned} Solv_7 &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}\right) \\ Solv_6 &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{E_{6(6)}}{Usp(8)}\right) \\ \dim Solv_7 &= 70 \quad ; \quad \mathrm{rank}\, Solv_7 = 7 \\ \dim Solv_6 &= 42 \quad ; \quad \mathrm{rank}\, Solv_6 = 6 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.9}$$

In eq.(5.4.7) $Solv_6$ is the solvable Lie algebra that describes the scalar sector of $D = 5$, $N = 8$ supergravity, while the 27–dimensional abelian ideal $\mathbb{D}_6$ corresponds to those $D = 4$ scalars that originate from the 27–vectors of supergravity one–dimension above [42]. Furthermore, we can also decompose the **56** charge representation of $E_{7(7)}$ with respect to $O(1,1) \times E_{6(6)}$ obtaining

$$\mathbf{56} \overset{Usp(8)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{27}) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{27}) \oplus (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}) \tag{5.4.10}$$

In order to single out the content of the first order Killing spinor equations we need to decompose them into irreducible $Usp(8)$ representations. The gravitino equation (5.3.13) is an **8** of $SU(8)$ that remains irreducible under $Usp(8)$ reduction. On the other hand the dilatino equation (5.3.12) is a **56** of $SU(8)$ that reduces as follows:

$$\mathbf{56} \stackrel{Usp(8)}{\longrightarrow} \mathbf{48} \oplus \mathbf{8} \tag{5.4.11}$$

Hence altogether we have that 3 Killing spinor equations in the representations **8**, **8′** , **48** constraining the scalar fields parametrizing the three subalgebras **42**, **1** and **27**. Working out the consequences of these constraints and deciding which scalars are set to constants, which are instead evolving and how many charges are different from zero is what we will do in a later section 5.5. As it will be explicitly seen there the content of the Killing spinor equations after $Usp(8)$ decomposition, is such as to set to a constant 69 scalar fields parametrizing $Solv_6 \oplus \mathbb{D}_6$ thus confirming the SLA analysis discussed in the above: indeed in this case $G_{norm} = O(1,1)$ and $H_{norm} = \mathbf{1}$, so that there is just one surviving field parametrizing $G_{norm} = O(1,1)$. Moreover, the same Killing spinor equations tell us that the 54 belonging to the two $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{27})$ representation of eq. (5.4.10) are actually zero, leaving only two non–vanishing charges transforming as a doublet of $O(1,1)$.

The 1/4 SUSY case

Here we have $n_{max} = 4$ and correspondingly the covariance subgroup of the Killing spinor equation is $Usp(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1) \subset SU(8)$. Indeed condition (5.4.1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^0 \epsilon_a &= \mathrm{i}\mathbb{C}_{ab}\,\epsilon^b \quad ; \quad a,b = 1,\ldots,4 \\ \epsilon_X &= 0; \quad X = 5,\ldots,8 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.12}$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{ab} = -\mathbb{C}_{ba}$ denotes a 4×4 antisymmetric matrix satisfying $\mathbb{C}^2 = -\mathbb{1}$. The group $Usp(4)$ is the subgroup of unimodular, unitary 4×4 matrices that are also symplectic, namely that preserve the matrix $\mathbb{C}$.

We are accordingly lead to decompose the solvable Lie algebra in the way we describe below. Recalling the decomposition with respect to the $S \otimes T$ duality subgroups given in eq.(5.2.17) and choosing the type IIA interpretation of $N = 8$ supergravity we can start from eq. (5.2.19), which we can summarize as follows:

$$Solv_7 = Solv_S \oplus Solv_T \oplus \mathcal{W}_{32} \tag{5.4.13}$$

$$70 = 2 + 36 + 32\ . \tag{5.4.14}$$

where we have adopted the shorthand notation

$$\begin{aligned} Solv_S &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{SL(2,R)}{U(1)}\right) \\ Solv_T &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{SO(6,6)}{SO(6)\times SO(6)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dim Solv_S &= 2 \quad ; \quad \mathrm{rank}\, Solv_S = 1 \\ \dim Solv_T &= 36 \quad ; \quad \mathrm{rank}\, Solv_T = 6 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.15}$$

As discussed in section 5.2.5 and more extensively explained in ref.s[41],[42], the solvable Lie algebras $Solv_S$ and $Solv_T$ describe the dilaton–axion sector and the six torus moduli, respectively, in the interpretation of $N = 8$ supergravity as the compactification of Type IIA theory on a six–torus T^6 [42]. The rank zero abelian subalgebra $\mathcal{W}_{32}$ is instead composed by the 32 Ramond-Ramond scalars.

Introducing the decomposition (5.4.13), (5.4.14) we have succeeded in singling out a holonomy subgroup $SU(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1) \subset SU(8)$. Indeed we have $SO(6) \equiv SU(4)$. This is a step forward but it is not yet the end of the story since we actually need a subgroup $Usp(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1)$ corresponding to the invariance group of the Killing spinor equation (5.3.13),(5.3.12) with parameter (5.4.12) . This means that we must further decompose the solvable Lie algebra $Solv_T$. This latter is the manifold of the scalar fields associated with vector multiplets in an $N = 4$ decomposition of the $N = 8$ theory. Indeed the decomposition (5.4.13) with respect to the S–T–duality subalgebra is the appropriate decomposition of the scalar sector according to $N = 4$ multiplets.

The further SLA decomposition we need is :

$$\begin{aligned} Solv_T &= Solv_{T5} \oplus Solv_{T1} \\ Solv_{T5} &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{SO(5,6)}{SO(5) \times SO(6)}\right) \\ Solv_{T1} &\equiv Solv\left(\frac{SO(1,6)}{SO(6)}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.16}$$

where we rely on the isomorphism $Usp(4) \equiv SO(5)$ and we have taken into account that the **70** irreducible representation of $SU(8)$ decomposes with respect to $Usp(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1)$ as follows

$$\mathbf{70} \overset{Usp(4)\times SU(4)\times U(1)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}+\overline{\mathbf{1}}) \oplus (\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4},\mathbf{1}) \tag{5.4.17}$$

Hence, altogether we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} Solv_7 &= Solv_S \oplus Solv_{T5} \oplus Solv_{T1} \oplus \mathcal{W}_{32} \\ 70 &= 2 + 30 + 6 + 32 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.18}$$

Just as in the previous case we should now single out the content of the first order Killing spinor equations by decomposing them into irreducible $Usp(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1)$ representations. The dilatino equations $\delta\chi_{ABC} = 0$, and the gravitino equation $\delta\psi_A = 0$, $A, B, C = 1, \ldots, 8$ ($SU(8)$ indices), decompose as follows

$$\mathbf{56} \overset{Usp(4)\times SU(4)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{1}) \oplus 2(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4},) \oplus (\mathbf{5},\mathbf{4}) \oplus (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{6}) \tag{5.4.19}$$

$$\mathbf{8} \overset{Usp(4)\times SU(4)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{4},) \tag{5.4.20}$$

As we shall see explicitly in section 5.6, the content of the reduced Killing spinor equations is such that only two scalar fields are essentially dynamical all the other being set to constant up to U- duality transformations. Moreover 52 charges are set to zero leaving 4 charges transforming in the $(2,2)$ representation of $Sl(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1)$. Note that in the present case on the basis of the SLA analysis given above, one would expect 3 scalar fields parametrizing $G_{norm}/H_{norm} = \frac{Sl(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)} \times O(1,1)$; however the relevant Killing spinor equation gives an extra reality constraint on the $\frac{Sl(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)}$ field thus reducing the number of non trivial scalar fields to two.

The 1/8 SUSY case

Here we have $n_{max} = 2$ and $Solv_7$ must be decomposed according to the decomposition of the isotropy subgroup: $SU(8) \longrightarrow SU(2) \times U(6)$. We showed in [44] that the corresponding decomposition of the solvable Lie algebra is the following one:

$$Solv_7 = Solv_3 \oplus Solv_4 \tag{5.4.21}$$

$$\begin{array}{rclrcl} Solv_3 & \equiv & Solv\left(SO^\star(12)/U(6)\right) & Solv_4 & \equiv & Solv\left(E_{6(4)}/SU(2)\times SU(6)\right) \\ \text{rank } Solv_3 & = & 3 & \text{rank } Solv_4 & = & 4 \\ \dim Solv_3 & = & 30 & \dim Solv_4 & = & 40 \end{array} \tag{5.4.22}$$

The rank three Lie algebra $Solv_3$ defined above describes the thirty dimensional scalar sector of $N = 6$ supergravity, while the rank four solvable Lie algebra $Solv_4$ contains the remaining forty scalars belonging to $N = 6$ spin 3/2 multiplets. It should be noted that, individually, both manifolds $\exp[Solv_3]$ and $\exp[Solv_4]$ have also an $N = 2$ interpretation since we have:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \exp[Solv_3] & = & \text{homogeneous special Kähler} \\ \exp[Solv_4] & = & \text{homogeneous quaternionic} \end{array} \tag{5.4.23}$$

so that the first manifold can describe the interaction of 15 vector multiplets, while the second can describe the interaction of 10 hypermultiplets. Indeed if we decompose the $N = 8$ graviton multiplet in $N = 2$ representations we find:

$$\text{N=8}\,\mathbf{spin\ 2} \stackrel{N=2}{\longrightarrow} \mathbf{spin\ 2} + 6 \times \mathbf{spin\ 3/2} + 15 \times \mathbf{vect.\ mult.} + 10 \times \mathbf{hypermult.} \tag{5.4.24}$$

Introducing the decomposition (5.4.21) we found in [44] that the 40 scalars belonging to $Solv_4$ are constants independent of the radial variable r. Only the 30 scalars in the Kähler algebra $Solv_3$ can be radial dependent. In fact their radial dependence is governed by a first order differential equation that can be extracted from a suitable component of the Killing spinor equation.The result in this case is that 64 of the scalar fields are actually constant while 6 are dynamical. Moreover 48 charges are annihilated leaving 6 nonzero charges transforming in the representation $(2,2,2)$ of the normalizer $G_{norm} = [Sl(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$. More precisely we obtained the following result. Up to U–duality transformations the most general $N = 8$ black–hole is actually an $N = 2$ black–hole corresponding to a very specific choice of the special Kähler manifold, namely $\exp[Solv_3]$ as in eq.(5.4.23),(5.4.22). Furthermore up to the duality rotations

of $SO^\star(12)$ this general solution is actually determined by the so called STU model studied in [48] and based on the solvable subalgebra:

$$Solv_{STU} \equiv Solv\left(\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3}{U(1)^3}\right) \subset Solv_3 \tag{5.4.25}$$

In other words the only truly independent degrees of freedom of the black hole solution are given by three complex scalar fields, S, T, U. This is the result we already anticipated in section 5.2.3 where we used the solvable Lie algebra $Solv_{STU}$ as a preferred example in one illustration of the general concept. The real parts of the scalar fields S, T and U correspond to the three Cartan generators of $Solv_3$ and have the physical interpretation of radii of the torus compactification from $D = 10$ to $D = 4$. The imaginary parts of these complex fields are generalised theta angles.

A more detailed argument leading to the conclusion that the only relevant scalar fields in the 1/8 solution are those of the STU–model goes as follows. Let

$$\vec{Q} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} p^{\vec{\Lambda}} \\ q_{\vec{\Sigma}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4.26}$$

be the vector of electric and magnetic charges that transforms in the **56** dimensional real representation of the U duality group $E_{7(7)}$. Through the Cayley matrix we can convert it to the $\mathbf{Usp}(\mathbf{56})$ basis namely to:

$$\begin{pmatrix} t^{\vec{\Lambda}_1} = p^{\vec{\Lambda}_1} + \mathrm{i}\, q_{\vec{\Lambda}_1} \\ \overline{t}_{\vec{\Lambda}_1} = p^{\vec{\Lambda}_1} - \mathrm{i}\, q_{\vec{\Lambda}_1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4.27}$$

Acting on $\vec{Q}$ by means of suitable $E_{7(7)}$ transformations, we can reduce it to a *normal* form:

$$\vec{Q} \to \vec{Q}^N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} t^0_{(1,1,1)} \\ t^1_{(1,1,15)} \\ t^2_{(1,1,15)} \\ t^3_{(1,1,15)} \\ 0 \\ \cdots \\ 0 \\ \\ \overline{t}^0_{(1,1,1)} \\ \overline{t}^1_{(1,1,15)} \\ \overline{t}^2_{(1,1,15)} \\ \overline{t}^3_{(1,1,15)} \\ 0 \\ \cdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4.28}$$

where there are only 4 complex (alternatively 8 real) independent charges and these charges are located in the representation $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{15})$ of the subgroup:

$$U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(6) \subset SU(8) \subset E_{7(7)} \tag{5.4.29}$$

Indeed the general decomposition of the fundamental 56–representation of $E_{7(7)}$ with respect to the subgroup (5.4.29) is:

$$\mathbf{56}_{real} = (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_{comp.} \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{6})_{comp.} \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{15})_{comp.} \tag{5.4.30}$$

Consequently also the central charge $\vec{Z} \equiv \left(Z^{AB}\,,\, Z_{CD}\right)$, which depends on $\vec{Q}$ through the coset representative in a symplectic–invariant way, through a suitable $SU(8)$ transformation will be brought to its *normal* form where it has only $4+4$ non–vanishing components. Since the decomposition of the complex **28** representation of $SU(8)$ under the subgroup (5.4.29) is the same as the decomposition of the real **56** of $E_{7(7)}$, namely eq.(5.4.30) we can also write:

$$\vec{Z} \to \vec{Z}^N \equiv \begin{pmatrix} z^0_{(1,1,1)} \\ z^1_{(1,1,15)} \\ z^2_{(1,1,15)} \\ z^3_{(1,1,15)} \\ 0 \\ \cdots \\ 0 \\ \\ \overline{z}^0_{(1,1,1)} \\ \overline{z}^1_{(1,1,15)} \\ \overline{z}^2_{(1,1,15)} \\ \overline{z}^3_{(1,1,15)} \\ 0 \\ \cdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4.31}$$

It is an easy consequence of elementary group theory, as it was shown in [49], [50] that $\vec{Q}^N$ is invariant with respect to the action of an $O(4,4)$ subgroup of $E_{7(7)}$ and its *normalizer* is an $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3 \subset E_{7(7)}$ commuting with it. Indeed it turns out that the eight real parameters in $\vec{Q}^N$ are singlets with respect to $O(4,4)$ and in a $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ irreducible representation of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$ as it is shown in the following decomposition of the **56** with respect to $O(4,4) \otimes SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$:

$$\mathbf{56} \to (\mathbf{8_v},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{8_s},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{8_{s'}},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) \tag{5.4.32}$$

The corresponding subgroup of $SU(8)$ leaving $\vec{Z}^N$ invariant is therefore $SU(2)^4 \cong SO(4) \times SO(4)$ which is the maximal compact subgroup of $O(4,4)$. The reader should compare this argument with the discussion in section 4.5.1 where we have shown that $SU(2)^4$ is the stabilizer of the central charge written in normal form and where we have argued that the most general form of the 1/8 solution should contain **5** parameters, that is:

$$\mathbf{5} = 56 - \dim \frac{SU(8)}{SU(2)^4} \tag{5.4.33}$$

Indeed we can write the generic **56**–dimensional charge vector $\vec{Q}$ in terms of five normal frame parameters plus 51 "angles" which parametrize the 51 dimensional compact space $\frac{SU(8)}{SU(2)^4}$, where

$SU(2)^4$ is the maximal compact subgroup of the stability group $O(4,4)$ [51]. This same counting is achieved by arguing at the level of the normalizer $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$. This latter contains a $U(1)^3 \subset SU(8)$ that can be used to gauge away three of the 4 phases of the 4 complex charges $t^\Lambda = p^\Lambda + iq_\Lambda$. Independently from the path used to reach it the conclusion is

Statement 5.4.1 *The generating solution of* $1/8$ *supersymmetry preserving* $N = 8$ *BPS black–holes depends on* 5*–essential parameters, namely four complex numbers with the same phase.*

Consider now the scalar *geodesic potential* defined in eq.(4.2.29), which identically can be rewritten as it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\,\overline{Z}^{AB}(\phi)\,Z_{AB}(\phi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\,\vec{Q}^T\,\left[\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\phi)\right]^T\,\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\phi)\,\vec{Q} \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.34}$$

As explained in section 4.3 the minimization of the potential (5.4.34) determines the fixed values of the scalar fields at the horizon of the black–hole. Because of its invariance properties the scalar potential $V(\phi)$ depends on $\vec{Z}$ and therefore on $\vec{Q}$ only through their normal forms. Since the fixed scalars at the horizon of the black–hole are obtained minimizing $V(\phi)$, it can be inferred that the most general solution of this kind will depend (modulo duality transformations) only on those scalar fields associated with the *normalizer* of the normal form $\vec{Q}^N$. Indeed the dependence of $V(\phi)$ on a scalar field is achieved by acting on $\vec{Q}$ in the expression of $V(\phi)$ by means of the transformations in $Solv_7$ associated with that field. Since at any point of the scalar manifold $V(\phi)$ can be made to depend only on $\vec{Q}^N$, its minimum will be defined only by those scalars that correspond to transformations acting on the non–vanishing components of the normal form (*normalizer* of $\vec{Q}^N$). Indeed all the other isometries were used to rotate $\vec{Q}$ to the normal form $\vec{Q}^N$. Among those scalars which are not determined by the fixed point conditions there are the *flat direction fields* namely those on which the scalar potential does not depend at all:

$$\text{flat direction field } q_f \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial q_f}\,V(\phi) = 0 \tag{5.4.35}$$

Some of these fields parametrize $Solv\,(O(4,4)/O(4)\times O(4))$ since they are associated with isometries leaving $\vec{Q}^N$ invariant, and the remaining ones are obtained from the latter by means of duality transformations. In order to identify the scalars which are *flat* directions of $V(\phi)$, let us consider the way in which $Solv\,(O(4,4))$ is embedded into $Solv_7$. To this effect we start by reviewing the algebraic structure of the solvable Lie algebras $Solv_3$ and $Solv_4$ defined by eq.s (5.4.22) Since $Solv_3$ and $Solv_4$ respectively define a special Kähler and a quaternionic manifold, it is useful to describe them in Alekseevski's formalism [43].

$Solv_3$:

$$\begin{aligned} Solv_3 &= F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3 \oplus \mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y} \oplus \mathbf{Z} \\ F_i &= \{\mathrm{h}_i\,,\,\mathrm{g}_i\} \quad i = 1,2,3 \\ \mathbf{X} &= \mathbf{X}^+ \oplus \mathbf{X}^- = \mathbf{X}_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{X}_{RR} \\ \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{Y}^+ \oplus \mathbf{Y}^- = \mathbf{Y}_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Y}_{RR} \\ \mathbf{Z} &= \mathbf{Z}^+ \oplus \mathbf{Z}^- = \mathbf{Z}_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_{RR} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
Solv\left(SU(3,3)_1\right) &= F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3 \oplus \mathbf{X}_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Y}_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_{NS} \\
Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3\right) &= F_1 \oplus F_2 \oplus F_3 \\
\mathcal{W}_{12} &= \mathbf{X}_{RR} \oplus \mathbf{Y}_{RR} \oplus \mathbf{Z}_{RR} \\
\dim\left(F_i\right) &= 2\,; \quad \dim\left(\mathbf{X}_{NS/RR}\right) = \dim\left(\mathbf{X}^{\pm}\right) = 4 \\
\dim\left(\mathbf{Y}_{NS/RR}\right) &= \dim\left(\mathbf{Y}^{\pm}\right) = \dim\left(\mathbf{Z}_{NS/RR}\right) = \dim\left(\mathbf{Z}^{\pm}\right) = 4 \\
\left[\mathrm{h}_i\,,\,\mathrm{g}_i\right] &= \mathrm{g}_i \quad i = 1,2,3 \\
\left[F_i\,,\,F_j\right] &= 0 \quad i \neq j \\
\left[\mathrm{h}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^{\pm}\right] &= \pm\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Y}^{\pm} \\
\left[\mathrm{h}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^{\pm}\right] &= \pm\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{X}^{\pm} \\
\left[\mathrm{h}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^{\pm}\right] &= \pm\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^{\pm} \\
\left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^{+}\right] &= \left[\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^{+}\right] = \left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^{+}\right] = 0 \\
\left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{Y}^{-}\right] &= \mathbf{Y}^{+}\,;\ \left[\mathrm{g}_2\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^{-}\right] = \mathbf{Z}^{+}\,;\ \left[\mathrm{g}_3\,,\,\mathbf{X}^{-}\right] = \mathbf{X}^{+} \\
\left[F_1\,,\,\mathbf{X}\right] &= \left[F_2\,,\,\mathbf{Y}\right] = \left[F_3\,,\,\mathbf{Z}\right] = 0 \\
\left[\mathbf{X}^{-}\,,\,\mathbf{Z}^{-}\right] &= \mathbf{Y}^{-}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.4.36}
$$

$Solv_4$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Solv_4 &= F_0 \oplus F_1' \oplus F_2' \oplus F_2' \\
&\quad \oplus \mathbf{X}'_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Y}'_{NS} \oplus \mathbf{Z}'_{NS} \oplus \mathcal{W}_{20} \\
Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})\right) \oplus Solv\left(SU(3,3)_2\right) &= \left[F_0\right] \oplus \Big[F_1' \oplus F_2' \oplus F_2' \\
&\quad \oplus \mathbf{X}'_{NS} \oplus\Big] \\
F_0 &= \left\{\mathrm{h}_0\,,\,\mathrm{g}_0\right\} \quad \left[\mathrm{h}_0\,,\,\mathrm{g}_0\right] = \mathrm{g}_0 \\
F_i' &= \left\{\mathrm{h}_i'\,,\,\mathrm{g}_i'\right\} \quad i = 1,2,3 \\
\left[F_0\,,\,Solv\left(SU(3,3)_2\right)\right] &= 0\,; \quad \left[\mathrm{h}_0\,,\,\mathcal{W}_{20}\right] = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{W}_{20} \\
\left[\mathrm{g}_0\,,\,\mathcal{W}_{20}\right] &= \left[\mathrm{g}_0\,,\,Solv\left(SU(3,3)_2\right)\right] = 0 \\
\left[Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})\right) \oplus Solv\left(SU(3,3)_2\right)\,,\,\mathcal{W}_{20}\right] &= \mathcal{W}_{20}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.4.37}
$$

The operators $\mathrm{h}_i \quad i = 1,2,3$ are the Cartan generators of $SO^{\star}(12)$ and g_i the corresponding axions which together with h_i complete the solvable algebra $Solv_{STU} \equiv Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3\right)$ Referring to the description of $Solv_4$ given in eqs. (5.4.37):

$$
\begin{aligned}
Solv\left(O(4,4)\right) &\subset Solv_4 \\
Solv\left(O(4,4)\right) &= F_0 \oplus F_1' \oplus F_2' \oplus F_3' \oplus \mathcal{W}_8
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.4.38}
$$

where the R–R part $\mathcal{W}_8$ of $Solv\left(O(4,4)\right)$ is the quaternionic image of $F_0 \oplus F_1' \oplus F_2' \oplus F_3'$ in $\mathcal{W}_{20}$. Therefore $Solv\left(O(4,4)\right)$ is parametrized by the 4 *hypermultiplets* con-

taining the Cartan fields of $Solv\left(E_{6(4)}\right)$. One finds that the other flat directions are all the remaining parameters of $Solv_4$, that is all the hyperscalars.

Alternatively we can observe that since the hypermultiplet scalars are flat directions of the potential, then we can use the solvable Lie algebra $Solv_4$ to set them to zero at the horizon. Since we know from the Killing spinor equations that these 40 scalars are constants it follows that we can safely set them to zero and forget about their existence (modulo U–duality transformations). Hence the non zero scalars required for a general solution have to be looked for among the vector multiplet scalars that is in the solvable Lie algebra $Solv_3$. In other words the most general $N = 8$ black–hole (up to U–duality rotations) is given by the most general $N = 2$ black–hole based on the 15–dimensional special Kähler manifold:

$$\mathcal{SK}_{15} \equiv \exp\left[Solv_3\right] = \frac{SO^{\star}(12)}{U(1) \times SU(6)} \tag{5.4.39}$$

Having determined the little group of the normal form enables us to decide which among the above 30 scalars have to be kept alive in order to generate the most general BPS black–hole solution (modulo U–duality).

We argue as follows. The *normalizer* of the normal form is contained in the largest subgroup of $E_{7(7)}$ commuting with $O(4,4)$. Indeed, a necessary condition for a group G^N to be the *normalizer* of $\vec{Q}^N$ is to commute with the *little group* $G^L = O(4,4)$ of $\vec{Q}^N$:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{Q}'^N &= G^N \cdot \vec{Q}^N \quad \vec{Q}^N = G^L \cdot \vec{Q}^N \\ \vec{Q}'^N &= G^L \cdot \vec{Q}'^N \Rightarrow \left[G^N\,,\, G^L\right] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.4.40}$$

As previously mentioned, it was proven that $G^N = SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3 \subset SO^{\star}(12)$ whose solvable algebra is defined by the last of eqs. (5.4.36). Moreover G^N coincides with the largest subgroup of $Solv_7$ commuting with G^L.
The duality transformations associated with the $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$ isometries act only on the eight non vanishing components of $\vec{Q}^N$ and therefore belong to $\mathbf{Sp(8)}$.

In conclusion the most general $N = 8$ black–hole solution is described by the 6 scalars parametrizing $Solv_{STU} \equiv Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3\right)$, which are the only ones involved in the fixed point conditions at the horizon.

Another way of seeing this is to notice that all the other 64 scalars are either the 16 parameters of $Solv\left(O(4,4)\right)$ which are flat directions of $V\left(\phi\right)$, or coefficients of the $48 = 56 - 8$ transformations needed to rotate $\vec{Q}$ into $\vec{Q}^N$ that is to set 48 components of $\vec{Q}$ to zero as shown in eq. (5.4.28).

Therefore in section 5.7 we shall reduce our attention to the Cartan vector multiplet sector, namely to the 6 vectors corresponding to the solvable Lie algebra $Solv\left(SL(2,\mathbb{R})\right)$.

5.5 Detailed study of the $1/2$ case

As established in section 5.4, the $N = 1/2$ SUSY preserving black hole solution of $N = 8$ supergravity has 4 equal skew eigenvalues in the normal frame for the central charges. The stabilizer of the normal form is $E_{6(6)}$ and the normalizer of this latter in $E_{7(7)}$ is $O\left(1,1\right)$:

$$E_{7(7)} \supset E_{6(6)} \times O\left(1,1\right) \tag{5.5.1}$$

According to our previous discussion, the relevant subgroup of the $SU(8)$ holonomy group is $Usp(8)$, since the BPS Killing spinor conditions involve supersymmetry parameters ϵ_A, ϵ^A satisfying eq.(5.4.5). Relying on this information, we can write the solvable Lie algebra decomposition (5.4.7),(5.4.8) of the $\sigma-$model scalar coset $\frac{E_{7(7)}}{SU(8)}$.

As discussed in the introduction, it is natural to guess that modulo $U-$duality transformations the complete solution is given in terms of a single scalar field parametrizing $O(1,1)$.

Indeed, we can now demonstrate that according to the previous discussion there is just one scalar field, parametrizing the normalizer $O(1,1)$, which appears in the final lagrangian, since the Killing spinor equations imply that 69 out of the 70 scalar fields are actually constants. In order to achieve this result, we have to decompose the $SU(8)$ tensors appearing in the equations (5.3.12),(5.3.13) with respect to $Usp(8)$ irreducible representations. According to the decompositions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{70} &\overset{Usp(8)}{=} \mathbf{42} \oplus \mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{28} &\overset{Usp(8)}{=} \mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.5.2}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ABCD} &= \overset{\circ}{P}_{ABCD} + \frac{3}{2} C_{[AB} \overset{\circ}{P}_{CD]} + \frac{1}{16} C_{[AB} C_{CD]} P \\ T_{AB} &= \overset{\circ}{T}_{AB} + \frac{1}{8} C_{AB} T \end{aligned} \tag{5.5.3}$$

where the notation $\overset{\circ}{t}_{A_1 \ldots, A_n}$ means that the antisymmetric tensor is $Usp(8)$ irreducible, namely has vanishing C-traces: $C^{A_1 A_2} \overset{\circ}{t}_{A_1 A_2 \ldots, A_n} = 0$.

Starting from equation (5.3.12) and using equation (5.4.5) we easily find:

$$4 P_{,a} \gamma^a \gamma^0 - 6 T_{ab} \gamma^{ab} = 0 \,, \tag{5.5.4}$$

where we have twice contracted the free $Usp(8)$ indices with the $Usp(8)$ metric C_{AB}. Next, using the decomposition (5.5.3), eq. (5.3.12) reduces to

$$-4 \left(\overset{\circ}{P}_{ABCD,a} + \frac{3}{2} \overset{\circ}{P}_{[CD,a} C_{AB]} \right) C^{DL} \gamma^a \gamma^0 - 3 \overset{\circ}{T}_{[AB} \delta^L_{C]} \gamma^{ab} = 0 \,. \tag{5.5.5}$$

Now we may alternatively contract equation (5.5.5) with C^{AB} or δ^L_C obtaining two relations on $\overset{\circ}{P}_{AB}$ and $\overset{\circ}{T}_{AB}$ which imply that they are separately zero:

$$\overset{\circ}{P}_{AB} = \overset{\circ}{T}_{AB} = 0 \,, \tag{5.5.6}$$

which also imply, taking into account (5.5.5)

$$\overset{\circ}{P}_{ABCD} = 0 \,. \tag{5.5.7}$$

Thus we have reached the conclusion

$$\begin{aligned} \overset{\circ}{P}_{ABCD|i} \, \partial_\mu \Phi^i \gamma^\mu \epsilon^D &= 0 \\ \overset{\circ}{P}_{AB|i} \, \partial_\mu \Phi^i \gamma^\mu \epsilon^B &= 0 \qquad (5.5.8) \\ \overset{\circ}{T}_{AB} &= 0 \qquad (5.5.9) \end{aligned}$$

implying that 69 out the 70 scalar fields are actually constant, while the only surviving central charge is that associated with the singlet two-form T. Since T_{AB} is a complex combination of the electric and magnetic field strengths 5.3.15, it is clear that eq. 5.5.9 implies the vanishing of 54 of the quantized charges $p^{\Lambda\Sigma}, q_{\Lambda\Sigma}$,the surviving two charges transforming as a doublet of $O(1,1)$ according to eq. (5.4.10). The only non-trivial evolution equation relates P and T as follows:

$$\left(\widehat{P}\partial_\mu\Phi\gamma^\mu - \frac{3}{2}\mathrm{i}\,T^{(-)}_{\rho\sigma}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\gamma^0\right)\epsilon_A = 0 \tag{5.5.10}$$

where we have set $P = \widehat{P}d\Phi$ and Φ is the unique non trivial scalar field parametrizing $O(1,1)$.

In order to make this equation explicit we perform the usual static ansätze. For the metric we set the ansatz (3.1.1). The scalar fields are assumed to be radial dependent as generally stated in eq. (3.1.3) and for the vector field strengths we assume the ansatz of eq.(3.6.4) which adapted to the $E_{7(7)}$ notation reads as follows:

$$F^{-\Lambda\Sigma} = \frac{1}{4\pi}t^{\Lambda\Sigma}(r)\,E^{(-)} \tag{5.5.11}$$

$$t^{\Lambda\Sigma}(r) = 2\pi\left(g + \mathrm{i}\ell(r)\right)^{\Lambda\Sigma} \tag{5.5.12}$$

The anti self dual form $E^{(-)}$ was defined in eq. (3.6.1). Using (5.3.8), (5.3.9), (5.3.15),(3.6.1),(5.5.11) we have

$$T^-_{ab} = \mathrm{i}\; t^{\Lambda\Sigma}(r)E^-_{ab}C^{AB}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{AB}\,. \tag{5.5.13}$$

A simple gamma matrix manipulation gives further

$$\gamma_{ab}\,E^{\mp}_{ab} = 2\mathrm{i}\frac{e^{2U}}{r^3}x^i\gamma^0\gamma^i\left(\frac{\pm 1+\gamma_5}{2}\right) \tag{5.5.14}$$

and we arrive at the final equation

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dr} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\ell(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}\,f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{AB}\,\frac{e^U}{r^2}\,. \tag{5.5.15}$$

In eq. (5.5.15), we have set $p^{\Lambda\Sigma} = 0$ since reality of the l.h.s. and of $f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{AB}$(see eq. (5.5.30)) imply the vanishing of the magnetic charge. Furthermore, we have normalized the vielbein component of the $Usp(8)$ singlet as follows

$$\widehat{P} = 4\sqrt{3} \tag{5.5.16}$$

which corresponds to normalizing the $Usp(8)$ vielbein as

$$P^{(singlet)}_{ABCD} = \frac{1}{16}PC_{[AB}C_{CD]} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}C_{[AB}C_{CD]}\,d\Phi\,. \tag{5.5.17}$$

This choice agrees with the normalization of the scalar fields existing in the current literature. Let us now consider the gravitino equation (5.3.13). Computing the spin connention $\omega^a{}_b$ from equation (3.1.1), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^{0i} &= \frac{dU}{dr}\frac{x^i}{r}e^{U(r)}V^0\\ \omega^{ij} &= 2\frac{dU}{dr}\,\frac{x_k}{r}\,\eta^{k[i}\,V^{j]}\,e^U\end{aligned} \tag{5.5.18}$$

where $V^0 = e^U\, dt$, $V^i = e^{-U}\, dx^i$. Setting $\epsilon_A = e^{f(r)}\zeta_A$, where ζ_A is a constant chiral spinor, we get

$$\left\{ \frac{df}{dr}\frac{x^i}{r} e^{f+U}\delta^B_A V^i + \Omega^{\ B}_{A,\alpha}\partial_i\Phi^\alpha e^f V^i \right.$$
$$\left. -\frac{1}{4}\left(2\frac{dU}{dr}\frac{x^i}{r}e^U e^f \left(\gamma^0\gamma^i V^0 + \gamma^{ij}V_j\right)\right)\delta^B_A \ +\ \delta^B_A\, T^-_{ab}\gamma^{ab}\gamma^c\gamma^0 V_c \right\}\zeta_B = 0 \qquad (5.5.19)$$

where we have used eqs.(5.3.13),(5.3.14), (5.5.3). This equation has two sectors; setting to zero the coefficient of V^0 or of $V^i\gamma^{ij}$ and tracing over the A, B indices we find two identical equations, namely:

$$\frac{dU}{dr} = -\frac{1}{8}\ell(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\frac{e^U}{r^2}C^{AB}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{\ AB}. \qquad (5.5.20)$$

Instead, if we set to zero the coefficient of V^i, we find a differential equation for the function $f(r)$, which is uninteresting for our purposes. Comparing now equations (5.5.15) and (5.5.20) we immediately find

$$\Phi = 2\sqrt{3}\, U \qquad (5.5.21)$$

5.5.1 Explicit computation of the Killing equations and of the reduced Lagrangian in the 1/2 case

In order to compute the l.h.s. of eq.s (5.5.15), (5.5.20) and the lagrangian of the 1/2 model, we need the explicit form of the coset representative $\mathbb{L}$ given in equation (5.3.1). This will also enable us to compute explicitly the r.h.s. of equations (5.5.15), (5.5.20). In the present case the explicit form of $\mathbb{L}$ can be retrieved by exponentiating the $Usp(8)$ singlet generator. As stated in equation (5.3.3), the scalar vielbein in the $Usp(28,28)$ basis is given by the off diagonal block elements of $\mathbb{L}^{-1}d\mathbb{L}$, namely

$$\mathbb{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \overline{P}_{ABCD} \\ P_{ABCD} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (5.5.22)$$

From equation (5.5.17), we see that the $Usp(8)$ singlet corresponds to the generator

$$\mathbb{K} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & C^{[AB}C^{HL]} \\ \hline C_{[CD}C_{RS]} & 0 \end{array}\right) \qquad (5.5.23)$$

and therefore, in order to construct the coset representative of the $O(1,1)$ subgroup of $E_{7(7)}$, we need only to exponentiate $\Phi\mathbb{K}$. Note that $\mathbb{K}$ is a $Usp(8)$ singlet in the **70** representation of $SU(8)$, but it acts non-trivially in the **28** representation of the quantized charges $\left(q_{AB}, p^{AB}\right)$. It follows that the various powers of $\mathbb{K}$ are proportional to the projection operators onto the irreducible $Usp(8)$ representations **1** and **27** of the charges:

$$\mathbb{P}_1 = \frac{1}{8}C^{AB}C_{RS} \qquad (5.5.24)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{27} = (\delta^{AB}_{RS} - \frac{1}{8}C^{AB}C_{RS}). \qquad (5.5.25)$$

Straightforward exponentiation gives

$$\exp(\Phi\mathbb{K}) = \cosh\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\Phi\right)\mathbb{P}_{27} + \frac{3}{2}\sinh\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\Phi\right)\mathbb{P}_{27}\mathbb{K}\mathbb{P}_{27} + \tag{5.5.26}$$

$$+\cosh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi\right)\mathbb{P}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sinh\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi\right)\mathbb{P}_1\mathbb{K}\mathbb{P}_1 \tag{5.5.27}$$

Since we are interested only in the singlet subspace

$$\mathbb{P}_1\exp[\Phi\mathbb{K}]\mathbb{P}_1 = \cosh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)\mathbb{P}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\sinh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)\mathbb{P}_1\mathbb{K}\mathbb{P}_1 \tag{5.5.28}$$

$$\mathbb{L}_{singlet} = \frac{1}{8}\left(\begin{array}{c|c} \cosh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)C^{AB}C_{CD} & \sinh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)C^{AB}C^{FG} \\ \hline \sinh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)C_{CD}C_{LM} & \cosh(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi)C_{CM}C^{FG} \end{array}\right). \tag{5.5.29}$$

Comparing (5.5.29) with the equation (5.3.1), we find [2]:

$$f = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi}C^{AB}C_{CD} \tag{5.5.30}$$

$$h = -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}\,e^{-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi}C_{AB}C_{CD} \tag{5.5.31}$$

and hence, using $\mathcal{N} = hf^{-1}$, we find

$$\mathcal{N}_{AB\,CD} = -\,\mathrm{i}\,\frac{1}{8}\,e^{-\sqrt{3}\Phi}C_{AB}C_{CD} \tag{5.5.32}$$

so that we can compute the r.h.s. of (5.5.15), (5.5.20). Using the relation (5.5.21) we find a single equation for the unknown functions $U(r)$, $\ell(r) = C_{\Lambda\Sigma}\ell^{\Lambda\Sigma}(r)$

$$\frac{dU}{dr} = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}\frac{\ell(r)}{r^2}\exp(-2U) \tag{5.5.33}$$

At this point to solve the problem completely we have to consider also the second order field equation obtained from the lagrangian. The bosonic supersymmetric lagrangian of the 1/2 preserving supersymmetry case is obtained from equation (5.3.5) by substituting the values of P_{ABCD} and $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma|\Gamma\Delta}$ given in equations (5.5.17) and (5.3.7) into equation (5.3.5). We find

$$\mathcal{L} = 2R - e^{-\sqrt{3}\Phi}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\Phi\partial^\mu\Phi \tag{5.5.34}$$

Note that this action has the general form of 0–brane action in $D = 4$ (compare with eq.(2.1.1)). Furthermore recalling eq.s (3.1.14), we see that the value of the parameter a is

$$a = \sqrt{3} \tag{5.5.35}$$

[2]Note that we are we are writing the coset matrix with the same pairs of indices $AB, CD, \ldots$ without distinction between the pairs $\Lambda\Sigma$ and AB as was done in sect.(5.3)

According to this we expect a solution where:

$$\begin{aligned} U &= -\frac{1}{4}\log H(r) \\ \Phi &= -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\log H(r) \\ \ell &= 2r^3\frac{d}{dr}\left(H(r)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = k \times \left(H(r)\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.5.36}$$

where $H(r) = 1 + k/r$ denotes a harmonic function. In the next subsection, by explicit calculation we show that this is indeed the BPS solution we obtain.

5.5.2 The $1/2$ solution

The resulting field equations are
Einstein equation:

$$U'' + \frac{2}{r}U' - (U)^2 = \frac{1}{4}(\Phi')^2 \tag{5.5.37}$$

Maxwell equation:

$$\frac{d}{dr}(e^{-\sqrt{3}\Phi}\ell(r)) = 0 \tag{5.5.38}$$

Dilaton equation:

$$\Phi'' + \frac{2}{r}\Phi' = -e^{-\sqrt{3}\Phi+2U}\ell(r)^2\frac{1}{r^4}\,. \tag{5.5.39}$$

From Maxwell equations one immediately finds

$$\ell\,(r) = e^{\sqrt{3}\Phi(r)}. \tag{5.5.40}$$

Taking into account (5.5.21), the second order field equation and the first order Killing spinor equation have the common solution

$$\begin{aligned} U &= -\frac{1}{4}\log H(x) \\ \Phi &= -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\log H(x) \\ \ell &= H(x)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.5.41}$$

where:

$$H(x) \equiv 1 + \sum_i \frac{k_i}{\vec{x} - \vec{x}_i^0} \tag{5.5.42}$$

is a harmonic function describing 0–branes located at $\vec{x}_\ell^0$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots$, each brane carrying a charge k_i. In particular for a single 0–brane we have:

$$H(x) = 1 + \frac{k}{r} \tag{5.5.43}$$

and the solution reduces to the expected form (5.5.36).

Recall also from eq.(3.1.14) that for $a = \sqrt{3}$ we have $\Delta = 4$. As it is shown in ref.[14] the parameter Δ is a dimensional reduction invariant so that we trace back the higher dimensional origin of the 1/2 BPS black hole from such a value. If we interpret $N = 8$ supergravity as the T^7 compactification of M–theory we can compare our present four–dimensional 0–brane solution with an eleven–dimensional $M2$–brane solution. They both have $\Delta = 4$ and preserve 1/2 of the 32 supersymmetry charges. We can identify our present black hole with the wrapping of the $M2$–brane on a 2–cycle of the seven–torus.

What we have shown is that the most general BPS-saturated black hole preserving 1/2 of the $N = 8$ supersymmetry is actually described by the lagrangian (5.5.34) with the solution given by (5.5.41), in the sense that any other solution with the same property can be obtained from the present one by an $E_{7(7)}$ (U-duality) transformation.

5.6 Detailed study of the $1/4$ case

Solutions preserving $\frac{1}{4}$ of $N = 8$ supersymmetry have two pairs of identical skew eigenvalues in the normal frame for the central charges. In this case the stability subgroup preserving the normal form is $O(5,5)$ with normalizer subgroup in $E_{(7,7)}$ given by $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1)$ (see [47]), according to the decomposition

$$E_{(7,7)} \supset O(5,5) \times SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1) = G_{stab} \times G_{norm} \tag{5.6.1}$$

The relevant fields parametrize $\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)} \times O(1,1)$ while the surviving charges transform in the representation $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ of $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1)$. The group $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ rotates electric into electric and magnetic into magnetic charges while $O(1,1)$ mixes them. $O(1,1)$ is therefore a true electromagnetic duality group.

5.6.1 Killing spinor equations in the $1/4$ case: surviving fields and charges.

The holonomy subgroup $SU(8)$ decomposes in our case as

$$SU(8) \to Usp(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1) \tag{5.6.2}$$

indeed in this case the killing spinors satisfy (5.4.12) where we recall the index convention:

$$\begin{aligned} &A, B = 1 \dots 8 \quad SU(8) \text{ indices} \\ &a, b = 1 \dots 4 \quad Usp(4) \quad \text{indices} \\ &X, Y = 5 \dots 8 \quad SU(4) \quad \text{indices} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.3}$$

and C_{ab} is the invariant metric of $Usp(4)$. With respect to the holonomy subgroup $SU(4) \times Usp(4)$, P_{ABCD} and T_{AB} appearing in the equations (5.3.12), (5.3.13) decompose as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{70} &\overset{Usp(4)\times SU(4)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4}) \oplus (\mathbf{5},\mathbf{6}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6}) \oplus (\overline{\mathbf{4}},\overline{\mathbf{4}}) \oplus (\overline{\mathbf{1}},\overline{\mathbf{1}}) \\ \mathbf{28} &\overset{Usp(4)\times SU(4)}{\longrightarrow} (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{6}) \oplus (\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4}) \oplus (\mathbf{5},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.4}$$

We decompose eq. (5.3.12) according to eq. (5.6.4). We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\chi_{XYZ} &= 0 && (5.6.5)\\
\delta\chi_{aXY} &= 0 && (5.6.6)\\
\delta\,\overset{\circ}{\chi}_{abX} &= C^{ab}\delta\chi_{abX} = 0 && (5.6.7)\\
\delta\chi_{abc} &= C_{[ab}\delta\chi_{c]} = 0. && (5.6.8)
\end{aligned}$$

From $\delta\chi_{XYZ} = 0$ we immediately get:

$$P_{XYZa,\alpha}\partial_\mu\Phi^\alpha = 0 \tag{5.6.9}$$

by means of which we recognize that 16 scalar fields are actually constant in the solution.

From the reality condition of the vielbein P_{ABCD} (equation (5.3.4)) we can also conclude

$$P_{Xabc} \equiv P_{X[a}C_{bc]} = 0 \tag{5.6.10}$$

so that there are 16 more scalar fields set to constants.

From $\delta\chi_{aXY} = 0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{XY,i}\partial_\mu\Phi^i\gamma^\mu\gamma^0\epsilon_a &= T_{XY\mu\nu}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_a && (5.6.11)\\
\overset{\circ}{P}_{XYab,i}\,\partial_\mu\Phi^i &= 0 && (5.6.12)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$P_{XYab} = \overset{\circ}{P}_{XYab} + \frac{1}{4}C_{ab}P_{XY} \tag{5.6.13}$$

Note that equation (5.6.12) sets 30 extra scalar fields to constant.

From $\delta\chi_{Xab} = 0$, using (5.6.10), one finds that also $T_{Xa} = 0$.

Finally, setting

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{abcd} &= C_{[ab}C_{cd]}P && (5.6.14)\\
T_{ab} &= \overset{\circ}{T}_{ab} + \frac{1}{4}C_{ab}T && (5.6.15)
\end{aligned}$$

the Killing spinor equation $\delta\chi_{abc} \equiv C_{[ab}\delta\chi_{c]} = 0$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overset{\circ}{T}_{ab} &= 0 && (5.6.16)\\
P_{,i}\partial_\mu\Phi^i\gamma^\mu\gamma^0 - \frac{3}{16}T_{\mu\nu}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_a &= 0 && (5.6.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Performing the gamma matrix algebra and using equation (5.5.14), the relevant evolution equations (5.6.11), (5.6.17) become

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{,i}\frac{d\Phi^i}{dr} &= \mathrm{i}\frac{3}{8}\left(p + \mathrm{i}\ell\left(r\right)\right)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{AB}C^{AB}\,\frac{e^U}{r^2}\\
P_{XY,i}\frac{d\Phi^i}{dr} &= 2\mathrm{i}\left(p + \mathrm{i}\ell\left(r\right)\right)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{XY}\,\frac{e^U}{r^2} && (5.6.18)
\end{aligned}$$

According to our previous discussion, $P_{XY,i}$ is the vielbein of the coset $\frac{O(1,6)}{SU(4)}$, which can be reduced to depend on 6 real fields Φ^i since, in force of the $SU(8)$ pseudo–reality condition (5.3.4), $P_{XY,i}$ satisfies an analogous pseudo–reality condition. On the other hand $P_{,i}$ is the vielbein of $\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)}$, and it is intrinsically complex. Indeed the $SU(8)$ pseudo–reality condition relates the $SU(4)$ singlet P_{XYZW} to the $Usp(4)$ singlet P_{abcd}. Hence $P_{,i}$ depends on a complex scalar field. In conclusion we find that equations (5.6.18) are evolutions equations for 8 real fields, the 6 on which $P_{XY,i}$ depends plus the 2 real fields sitting in $P_{,i}$. However, according to the discussion given above, we expect that only three scalar fields, parametrizing $\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)} \times O(1,1)$ should be physically relevant. To retrieve this number we note that $O(1,1)$ is the subgroup of $O(1,6)$ which commutes with the stability subgroup $O(5,5)$, and hence also with its maximal compact subgroup $Usp(4) \times Usp(4)$. Therefore out of the 6 fields of $\frac{O(1,6)}{O(6)}$ we restrict our attention to the real field parametrizing $O(1,1)$, whose corresponding vielbein is $C^{XY}P_{XY} = P_1 d\Phi_1$. Thus the second of equations (5.6.18) can be reduced to the evolution equation for the single scalar field Φ_1, namely:

$$P_1 \frac{d\Phi^1}{dr} = -2\ell\,(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta} f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{XY}\,\frac{e^U}{r^2} \tag{5.6.19}$$

In this equation we have set the magnetic charge $p^{\Lambda\Sigma} = 0$ since, as we show explicitly later, the quantity $\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta} f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{ab}$ is actually real. Hence, since the left hand side of equation (5.6.19) is real, we are forced to set the corresponding magnetic charge to zero. On the other hand, as we now show, inspection of the gravitino Killing spinor equation, together with the first of equations (5.6.18), further reduces the number of fields to two. Indeed, let us consider the $\delta\psi_A = 0$ Killing spinor equation. The starting equation is the same as (5.5.19), (5.3.15). In the present case, however, the indices $A, B, \ldots$ are $SU(8)$ indices, which have to be decomposed with respect to $SU(4) \times Usp(4) \times U(1)$. Then, from $\delta\Psi_X = 0$, we obtain

$$\Omega^a_X = 0; \quad T_{Xa} = 0 \tag{5.6.20}$$

From $\delta\psi_a = 0$ we obtain an equation identical to (5.5.19) with $SU(8)$ indices replaced by $SU(4)$ indices. With the same computations performed in the $Usp(8)$ case we obtain the final equation

$$\frac{dU}{dr} = -\frac{1}{4}\ell\,(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\frac{e^U}{r^2} C^{ab}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta} f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{ab}\,, \tag{5.6.21}$$

where we have taken into account that $C^{ab}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta} f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{ab}$ must be real real, implying the vanishing of the magnetic charge corresponding to the singlet of $U(1) \times SU(4) \times Usp(4)$. Furthermore, since the right hand side of the equation (5.6.18) is proportional to the right hand side of the gravitino equation, it turns out that the vielbein P_i must also be real. Let us name Φ_2 the scalar field appearing in left hand side of the equation (5.6.18), and P_2 the corresponding vielbein component. Equation (5.6.18) can be rewritten as:

$$P_2 \frac{d\Phi_2}{dr} = -\frac{3}{8}\ell\,(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta} f^{\Gamma\Delta}_{XY}\,C^{XY}\frac{e^U}{r^2} \tag{5.6.22}$$

In conclusion, we see that the most general model describing BPS–saturated solutions preserving $\frac{1}{4}$ of $N = 8$ supersymmetry is given, modulo $E_{7(7)}$ transformations, in terms of two scalar fields and two electric charges.

5.6.2 Derivation of the $1/4$ reduced lagrangian in Young basis

Our next step is to write down the lagrangian for this model. This implies the construction of the coset representative of $\frac{SL(2,\mathbb{R})}{U(1)} \times O(1,1)$ in terms of which the kinetic matrix of the vector fields and the σ–model metric of the scalar fields is constructed.

Once again we begin by considering such a construction in the Young basis where the field strengths are labelled as antisymmetric tensors and the $E_{7(7)}$ generators are written as $Usp(28,28)$ matrices.

The basic steps in order to construct the desired lagrangian consist of

1. Embedding of the appropriate $SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \times O(1,1)$ Lie algebra in the $Usp_Y(28,28)$ basis for the **56** representation of $E_{7(7)}$
2. Performing the explicit exponentiation of the two commuting Cartan generators of the above algebra
3. Calculating the restriction of the $\mathbb{L}$ coset representative to the 4–dimensional space spanned by the $Usp(4) \times Usp(4)$ singlet field strengths and by their magnetic duals
4. Deriving the restriction of the matrix $\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ to the above 4–dimensional space.
5. Calculating the explicit form of the scalar vielbein P^{ABCD} and hence of the scalar kinetic terms.

Let us begin with the first issue. To this effect we consider the following two antisymmetric 8×8 matrices:

$$\varpi_{AB} = -\varpi_{BA} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} C & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array}\right) \quad ; \quad \Omega_{AB} = -\Omega_{BA} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C \end{array}\right) \tag{5.6.23}$$

where each block is 4×4 and the non vanishing block C satisfies [3]:

$$C^T = -C \quad ; \quad C^2 = -\mathbb{1} \tag{5.6.24}$$

The subgroup $Usp(4) \times Usp(4) \subset SU(8)$ is defined as the set of unitary unimodular matrices that preserve simultaneously ϖ and Ω:

$$A \in Usp(4) \times Usp(4) \subset SU(8) \quad \leftrightarrow \quad A^\dagger \varpi A = \varpi \quad \text{and} \quad A^\dagger \Omega A = \Omega \tag{5.6.25}$$

Obviously any other linear combinations of these two matrices is also preserved by the same subgroup so that we can also consider:

$$\tau^{\pm}_{AB} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\varpi_{AB} \pm \Omega_{AB}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} C & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \pm C \end{array}\right) \tag{5.6.26}$$

Introducing also the matrices:

$$\pi_{AB} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array}\right) \quad ; \quad \Pi_{AB} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \mathbb{1} \end{array}\right) \tag{5.6.27}$$

[3] The upper and lower matrices appearing in ω_{AB} and in Ω_{AB} are actually the matrices C_{ab}, $a, b = 1, \ldots, 4$ and C_{XY} $X, Y = 1, \ldots, 4$ used in the previous section.

we have the obvious relations:

$$\pi_{AB} \,=\, -\varpi_{AC}\,\varpi_{CB} \quad ; \quad \Pi_{AB} \,=\, -\Omega_{AC}\,\Omega_{CB} \tag{5.6.28}$$

In terms of these matrices we can easily construct the projection operators that single out from the **28** of $SU(8)$ its $Usp(4)\times Usp(4)$ irreducible components according to:

$$\mathbf{28} \quad \stackrel{Usp(4)\times Usp(4)}{\Longrightarrow} \quad (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0})\oplus(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{1})\oplus(\mathbf{5},\mathbf{0})\oplus(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{5})\oplus(\mathbf{4},\mathbf{4}) \tag{5.6.29}$$

These projection operators are matrices mapping antisymmetric 2–tensors into antisymmetric 2–tensors and read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\,RS} &= \frac{1}{4}\,\varpi_{AB}\,\varpi_{RS}\\
\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\,RS} &= \frac{1}{4}\,\Omega_{AB}\,\Omega_{RS}\\
\mathbb{P}^{(5,0)}_{AB\,RS} &= \frac{1}{2}\,(\pi_{AR}\,\pi_{BS} \,-\, \pi_{AS}\,\pi_{BR}) \,-\, \frac{1}{4}\,\varpi_{AB}\,\varpi_{RS}\\
\mathbb{P}^{(0,5)}_{AB\,RS} &= \frac{1}{2}\,(\Pi_{AR}\,\Pi_{BS} \,-\, \Pi_{AS}\,\Pi_{BR}) \,-\, \frac{1}{4}\,\Omega_{AB}\,\Omega_{RS}\\
\mathbb{P}^{(4,4)}_{AB\,RS} &= \frac{1}{8}\,(\pi_{AR}\,\Pi_{BS} \,+\, \Pi_{AR}\,\pi_{BS} \,-\, \pi_{AS}\,\Pi_{BR} \,-\, \Pi_{AS}\,\pi_{BR})
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6.30}$$

We also introduce the following shorthand notations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell^{AB}_{RS} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\,(\pi_{AR}\,\pi_{BS} \,-\, \pi_{AS}\,\pi_{BR})\\
L^{AB}_{RS} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\,(\Pi_{AR}\,\Pi_{BS} \,-\, \Pi_{AS}\,\Pi_{BR})\\
U^{ABCD} &\equiv \varpi^{[AB}\,\varpi^{CD]} \,=\, \frac{1}{3}\Big[\varpi^{AB}\,\varpi^{CD} + \varpi^{AC}\,\varpi^{DB} \,+\, \varpi^{AD}\,\varpi^{BC}\Big]\\
W^{ABCD} &\equiv \Omega^{[AB}\,\Omega^{CD]} \,=\, \frac{1}{3}\Big[\Omega^{AB}\,\Omega^{CD} + \Omega^{AC}\,\Omega^{DB} \,+\, \Omega^{AD}\,\Omega^{BC}\Big]\\
Z^{ABCD} &\equiv \varpi^{[AB}\,\Omega^{CD]} \,=\, \frac{1}{6}\Big[\varpi^{AB}\,\Omega^{CD} + \varpi^{AC}\,\Omega^{DB}\,\varpi^{AD}\,\Omega^{BC}\\
&\qquad + \Omega^{AB}\,\varpi^{CD} + \Omega^{AC}\,\varpi^{DB} \,+\, \Omega^{AD}\,\varpi^{BC}\Big]
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6.31}$$

Then by direct calculation we can verify the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{ABRS}\,Z_{RSUV} &= \frac{4}{9}\Big(\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\,UV} \,+\, \mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\,UV} \,+\, \mathbb{P}^{(4,4)}_{AB\,UV}\Big)\\
U_{ABRS}\,U_{RSUV} &= \frac{4}{9}\,\ell^{AB}_{UV}\\
W_{ABRS}\,W_{RSUV} &= \frac{4}{9}\,L^{AB}_{UV}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6.32}$$

Using the above identities we can write the explicit embedding of the relevant $SL(2,\mathbb{R})\times O(1,1)$ Lie algebra into the $E_{7(7)}$ Lie algebra, realized in the Young basis, namely in terms of $Usp(28,28)$

matrices. Abstractly we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} SL(2,\mathbb{R}) \text{ algebra} & \longrightarrow & \begin{cases} [L_+\,,\,L_-] = 2\,L_0 \\ [L_0\,,\,L_\pm] = \pm\,L_\pm \end{cases} \\ O(1,1) \text{ algebra} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C} \\ \text{and they commute} & & [\mathcal{C}\,,\,L_\pm] = [\mathcal{C}\,,\,L_0] = 0 \end{array} \tag{5.6.33}$$

The corresponding $E_{7(7)}$ generators in the **56** Young basis representation are:

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & \frac{3}{4}\left(U^{ABFG}+W^{ABFG}\right) \\ \hline \frac{3}{4}\left(U_{LMCD}+W_{LMCD}\right) & 0 \end{array}\right) \\ L_\pm &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \pm\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(\ell^{AB}_{CD}-L^{AB}_{CD}\right) & \mathrm{i}\,\frac{3}{4}\left(U^{ABFG}-W^{ABFG}\right) \\ \hline -\mathrm{i}\,\frac{3}{4}\left(U_{LMCD}-W_{LMCD}\right) & \mp\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(\ell^{LM}_{FG}-L^{LM}_{FG}\right) \end{array}\right) \\ \mathcal{C} &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & \frac{3}{4}Z^{ABFG} \\ \hline \frac{3}{4}Z_{LMCD} & 0 \end{array}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.34}$$

The non–compact Cartan subalgebra of $SL(2,\mathbb{R})\times O(1,1)$, spanned by $L_0\,,\mathcal{C}$ is a 2–dimensional subalgebra of the full $E_{7(7)}$ Cartan subalgebra. As such this abelian algebra is also a subalgebra of the 70–dimensional solvable Lie algebra $Solv_7$ defined in eq. (5.4.9). The scalar fields associated with L_0 and $\mathcal{C}$ are the two dilatons parametrizing the reduced bosonic lagrangian we want to construct. Hence our programme is to construct the coset representative:

$$\mathbb{L}(\Phi_1,\Phi_2) \equiv \exp\left[\Phi_1\mathcal{C}+\Phi_2 L_0\right] \tag{5.6.35}$$

and consider its restriction to the 4–dimensional space spanned by the $Usp(4)\times Usp(4)$ singlets ϖ_{AB} and Ω_{AB}. Using the definitions (5.6.30) and (5.6.31) we can easily verify that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{RSUV}\,\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{UV\;PQ} &= 0 \\ \mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{RSUV}\,\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{UV\;PQ} &= 0 \\ \mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{RSUV}\,\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{UV\;PQ} &= \frac{1}{8}\varpi_{AB}\,\Omega_{PQ} \\ \mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{RSUV}\,\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{UV\;PQ} &= \frac{1}{8}\Omega_{AB}\,\varpi_{PQ} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.36}$$

and similarly:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,\left(U^{RSUV}+W^{RSUV}\right)\,\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{UV\;PQ} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\;PQ} \\ \mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,\left(U^{RSUV}+W^{RSUV}\right)\,\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{UV\;PQ} &= 0 \\ \mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,\left(U^{RSUV}+W^{RSUV}\right)\,\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{UV\;PQ} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\;PQ} \\ \mathbb{P}^{(0,1)}_{AB\;RS}\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{RSUV}\,\mathbb{P}^{(1,0)}_{UV|PQ} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.37}$$

This means that in the 4–dimensional space spanned by the $Usp(4) \times Usp(4)$ singlets, using also the definition (5.6.26) and the shorthand notation

$$\Phi^{\pm} = \frac{\Phi_2 \pm \Phi_1}{2} \tag{5.6.38}$$

the coset representative can be written as follows

$$\exp\left[\Phi_1 \mathcal{C} + \Phi_2 L_0\right] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \cosh\Phi^+ \frac{1}{2}\tau^+_{AB}\tau^+_{CD} + \cosh\Phi^- \frac{1}{2}\tau^-_{AB}\tau^-_{CD} & \sinh\Phi^+ \frac{1}{2}\tau^+_{AB}\tau^+_{CD} + \sinh\Phi^- \frac{1}{2}\tau^-_{AB}\tau^-_{CD} \\ \hline \sinh\Phi^+ \frac{1}{2}\tau^+_{AB}\tau^+_{CD} + \sinh\Phi^- \frac{1}{2}\tau^-_{AB}\tau^-_{CD} & \cosh\Phi^+ \frac{1}{2}\tau^+_{AB}\tau^+_{CD} + \cosh\Phi^- \frac{1}{2}\tau^-_{AB}\tau^-_{CD} \end{array}\right) \tag{5.6.39}$$

Starting from eq.(5.6.39) we can easily write down the matrices $f_{AB\ CD}, h_{AB\ CD}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{AB\ CD}$. We immediately find:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{AB\ CD} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\exp[\Phi^+]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^+_{AB}\,\tau^+_{CD} + \exp[\Phi^-]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^-_{AB}\,\tau^-_{CD}\right) \\ h_{AB\ CD} &= -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\exp[-\Phi^+]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^+_{AB}\,\tau^+_{CD} + \exp[-\Phi^-]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^-_{AB}\,\tau^-_{CD}\right) \\ \mathcal{N}_{AB\ CD} &= -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{4}\left(\exp[-2\,\Phi^+]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^+_{AB}\,\tau^+_{CD} + \exp[-2\,\Phi^-]\,\frac{1}{2}\,\tau^-_{AB}\,\tau^-_{CD}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.40}$$

To complete our programme, the last point we have to deal with is the calculation of the scalar vielbein P^{ABCD}. We have:

$$\mathbb{L}^{-1}(\Phi_1,\Phi_2)\,d\,\mathbb{L}(\Phi_1,\Phi_2) = \frac{3}{4}\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & d\Phi_1\,Z^{ABFG} + d\Phi_2\,\left(U^{ABFG} + W^{ABFG}\right) \\ \hline d\Phi_1\,Z^{LMCD} + d\Phi_2\,\left(U^{LMCD} + W^{LMCD}\right) & 0 \end{array}\right) \tag{5.6.41}$$

so that we get:

$$P^{ABCD} = d\Phi_1\,\frac{3}{4}\,Z^{ABCD} + d\Phi_2\,\frac{3}{4}\,\left(U^{ABCD} + W^{ABCD}\right) \tag{5.6.42}$$

and with a straightforward calculation:

$$P^{ABCD}_{\mu}\,P^{\mu}_{ABCD} = \frac{3}{2}\,\partial_\mu\Phi_1\,\partial^\mu\Phi_1 + 3\,\partial_\mu\Phi_2\,\partial^\mu\Phi_2 \tag{5.6.43}$$

Hence recalling the normalizations of the supersymmetric $N = 8$ lagrangian (5.3.5), and introducing the two $Usp(4) \times Usp(4)$ singlet electromagnetic fields:

$$A^{AB}_{\mu} = \tau^+_{AB}\,\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\,\mathcal{A}^1_\mu + \tau^-_{AB}\,\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\,\mathcal{A}^2_\mu + 26 \text{ non singlet fields} \tag{5.6.44}$$

we get the following reduced Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{1/4}_{red} &= \sqrt{-g}\,\Big[2\,R[g] + \frac{1}{4}\,\partial_\mu\Phi_1\,\partial^\mu\Phi_1 + \frac{1}{2}\,\partial_\mu\Phi_2\,\partial^\mu\Phi_2 \\ &\quad - \exp\left[-\Phi_1 - \Phi_2\right]\left(F^1_{\mu\nu}\right)^2 - \exp\left[\Phi_1 - \Phi_2\right]\left(F^2_{\mu\nu}\right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.45}$$

Redefining:

$$\Phi_1 = \sqrt{2}\, h_1 \quad ; \quad \Phi_2 = h_2 \tag{5.6.46}$$

we obtain the final standard form for the reduced lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{1/4}_{red} &= \sqrt{-g}\left[2\,R[g] + \frac{1}{2}\,\partial_\mu h_1\,\partial^\mu h_1 + \frac{1}{2}\,\partial_\mu h_2\,\partial^\mu h_2\right. \\ &\left. - \exp\left[-\sqrt{2}\,h_1 - h_2\right]\left(F^1_{\mu\nu}\right)^2 - \exp\left[\sqrt{2}\,h_1 - h_2\right]\left(F^2_{\mu\nu}\right)^2\right. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.47}$$

5.6.3 Solution of the reduced field equations

We can easily solve the field equations for the reduced lagrangian (5.6.47). The Einstein equation is

$$U'' + \frac{2}{r}U' - \left(U'\right)^2 = \frac{1}{4}\,\left(h_1'\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\,\left(h_2'\right)^2, \tag{5.6.48}$$

the Maxwell equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2}\,h_1' - h_2' &= -\frac{\ell_2'}{\ell_2} \\ -\sqrt{2}\,h_1' - h_2' &= -\frac{\ell_1'}{\ell_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.49}$$

the scalar equations are

$$\begin{aligned} h_1'' + \frac{2}{r}h_1' &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}r^4}\left(e^{\sqrt{2}h_1 - h_2 + 2U}\,\ell_2^2 - e^{-\sqrt{2}h_1 - h_2 + 2U}\,\ell_1^2\right) \\ h_2'' + \frac{2}{r}h_2' &= \frac{1}{2r^4}\left(e^{\sqrt{2}h_1 - h_2 + 2U}\,\ell_2^2 + e^{-\sqrt{2}h_1 - h_2 + 2U}\,\ell_1^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.50}$$

The solution of the Maxwell equations is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1\,(r) &= \ell_1 e^{\sqrt{2}h_1 + h_2} \\ \ell_2\,(r) &= \ell_2 e^{-\sqrt{2}h_1 + h_2} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.51}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1 &\equiv \ell_1\,(\infty) \\ \ell_2 &\equiv \ell_2\,(\infty) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.52}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\log\,\frac{H_1}{H_2} \\ h_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}\,\log\,H_1 H_2 \\ U &= -\frac{1}{4}\ln H_1 H_2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.53}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(r) &= 1+\sum_i \frac{k_i^1}{\vec{x}-\vec{x}_i^{(1)}} \\ H_2(r) &= 1+\sum_i \frac{l_i^2}{\vec{x}-\vec{x}_i^{(2)}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.54}$$

are a pair of harmonic functions.

We can summarize the form of 1/4 solution writing:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= (H_1\,H_2)^{-1/2}\,dt^2-(H_1\,H_2)^{1/2}\left(dr^2+r^2d\Omega_2\right) \\ h_1 &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\log\frac{H_1}{H_2} \\ h_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}\log\left[H_1\,H_2\right] \\ F^{1,2} &= -dt\wedge d\vec{x}\cdot\frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial x}\,(H_{1,2})^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.55}$$

Let us now observe that by specializing eq.s(5.6.55) to the case where the two harmonic functions are equal $H_1(r)=H_2(r)=H(r)$ we exactly match the case $a=1$, $\Delta=2$ of eq.(3.1.14). Indeed for this choice we have $h_1=0$ and the two vector field strengths can be identified since they are identical. The metric, the surviving scalar field h_2 and the electric field they all have the form predicted in eq.(3.1.14). Looking back at eq.(5.6.47) we see that the parameter a for h_2 is indeed $a=1$ once h_1 is suppressed. This explains why we claimed that the $a=1$ 0–brane corresponds to the case of 1/4–preserved supersymmetry. The generating solution for 1/4 BPS black–holes is more general since it involves two harmonic functions but the near–horizon behaviour of all such solutions is the that of $a=1$ model. Indeed near the horizon $r=0$ all harmonic functions are proportional.

5.6.4 Comparison with the Killing spinor equations

In this section we show that the Killing spinor equations (5.6.19), (5.6.22) are identically satisfied by the solution (5.6.55) giving no further restriction on the harmonic function H_1, H_2. Using the formalism developed in section 5.6.2 the equations (5.6.19), (5.6.22) can be combined as follows:

$$\frac{16}{3}P_2\frac{d\Phi_2}{dr}\pm P_1\frac{d\Phi_1}{dr}=-2\ell\,(r)^{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\tau^{(\pm)AB}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{AB}\frac{e^U}{r^2} \tag{5.6.56}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 d\Phi_2 &= \frac{3}{8}C^{ab}C^{cd}P_{abcd}=\frac{3}{8}U^{ABCD}P_{ABCD}=\frac{3}{4}d\Phi_2 \\ P_1 d\Phi_1 &= C^{XY}C^{ab}P_{XYab}=Z^{ABCD}P_{ABCD}=2d\Phi_1 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.57}$$

furthermore, using equations (5.6.40), we have

$$\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma,\Gamma\Delta}f^{\Gamma\Delta}{}_{AB}=-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\left(e^{-\Phi_+}\tau^{(+)\Lambda\Sigma}\tau^{(+)AB}+e^{-\Phi_-}\tau^{(-)\Lambda\Sigma}\tau^{(-)AB}\right). \tag{5.6.58}$$

Therefore, the equation (5.6.56) becomes

$$4\frac{d\Phi_2}{dr} \pm 2\frac{d\Phi_1}{dr} = 4\sqrt{2}\tau^{(\pm)}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\ell^{\Lambda\Sigma}\frac{e^{U-\Phi_\pm}}{r^2} \tag{5.6.59}$$

Using equation (5.6.44) we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{(+)}_{\Lambda\Sigma}q^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\ell_1(r) \\ \tau^{(-)}_{\Lambda\Sigma}q^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\ell_2(r)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.60}$$

Comparing equation (5.6.55) with (5.5.30), (3.6.1), (5.5.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1 &= -r^2\frac{H_1'}{H_1^2}\sqrt{H_1H_2} \\ \ell_2 &= -r^2\frac{H_2'}{H_2^2}\sqrt{H_1H_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6.61}$$

Using all these information, a straightforward computation shows that the Killing spinor equations are identically satisfied.

5.7 Detailed study of the $1/8$ case

As previously emphasized, the most general 1/8 black–hole solution of $N = 8$ supergravity is, up to U–duality transformations, a solution of an STU model suitably embedded in the original $N = 8$ theory. Therefore, in dealing with the STU model we would like to keep trace of this embedding. To this end, we shall use, as anticipated, the mathematical tool of SLA which in general provides a suitable and simple description of the embedding of a supergravity theory in a larger one. The SLA formalism is very useful in order to give a geometrical and a quasi easy characterization of the different dynamical scalar fields belonging to the solution. Secondly, it enables one to write down the somewhat heavy first order differential system of equations for all the fields and to compute all the geometrical quantities appearing in the effective supergravity theory in a clear and direct way. Instead of considering the STU model embedded in the whole $N = 8$ theory with scalar manifold $\mathcal{M} = E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$, it suffices to focus on its $N = 2$ truncation with scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3} = [SU(3,3)/SU(3)\times U(3)]\times\mathcal{M}_{Quat}$ which describes the classical limit of type IIA Supergravity compactified on $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3$, $\mathcal{M}_{Quat}$ being the quaternionic manifold $SO(4,1)/SO(4)$ describing 1 hyperscalar. Within this latter simpler model we are going to construct the $N = 2$ STU model as a consistent truncation. Indeed the embedding of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3}$ inside the $N = 8$ has already been described in eq.s(5.4.36) where we have shown the embedding of the corresponding solvable Lie algebra into $Solv_3 \subset Solv_7$. The embedding of the STU scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{STU} = (SL(2,\mathbb{R})/U(1))^3$ inside $\mathcal{M}_{T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3}$ was described as an example in section 5.2.4 (see in particular eq.(5.2.9)). On the other hand in section 5.4 we discussed how, up to $H = SU(8)$ transformations, the $N = 8$ central charge which is an 8×8 antisymmetric complex matrix can always be brought to its *normal* form in which it is skew–diagonal with complex eigenvalues Z, Z_i, $i = 1,2,3$ ($|Z| > |Z_i|$). In order to do this one needs to make a suitable 48–parameter $SU(8)$ transformation on the central charge.

This transformation may be seen as the result of a 48–parameter $E_{7(7)}$ duality transformation on the 56 dimensional charge vector and on the 70 scalars which, in the expression of the central charge, sets to zero 48 scalars (24 vector scalars and 24 hyperscalars from the $N = 2$ point of view) and 48 charges. Taking into account that there are 16 scalars parametrizing the submanifold $SO(4,4)/SO(4) \times SO(4)$, $SO(4,4)$ being the centralizer of the normal form, on which the eigenvalues of the central charge do not depend at all, the central charge, in its normal form will depend only on the 6 scalars and 8 charges defining an STU model. The isometry group of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ is $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$, which is the *normalizer* of the normal form, i.e. the residual U–duality which can still act non trivially on the 6 scalars and 8 charges while keeping the central charge skew diagonalized. As we show in the sequel, the 6 scalars of the STU model consist of 3 axions a_i and 3 dilatons p_i, whose exponential $\exp p_i$ will be denoted by $-b_i$.

In the framework of the STU model, the eigenvalues $Z(a_i, b_i, p^\Lambda, q_\Lambda)$ and $Z_i(a_i, b_i, p^\Lambda, q_\Lambda)$ are, respectively the local realization on moduli space of the $N = 2$ supersymmetry algebra central charge and of the 3 *matter* central charges associated with the 3 matter vector fields (see eq.(3.6.14) and eq.(3.6.15)). The BPS condition for a 1/8 black–hole is that the ADM mass should equal the modulus of the central charge:

$$M_{ADM} = |Z(a_i, b_i, p^\Lambda, q_\Lambda)|. \tag{5.7.1}$$

As explained in section 3.6.1, at the horizon the field dependent central charge $|Z|$ flows to its minimum value:

$$\begin{aligned} |Z|_{min}(p^\Lambda, q_\Lambda) &= |Z(a_i^{fix}, b_i^{fix}, p^\Lambda, q_\Lambda)| \\ 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial a_i}|Z|_{a=b=fixed} = \frac{\partial}{\partial a_i}|Z|_{a=b=fixed} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.2}$$

which is obtained by extremizing it with respect to the 6 moduli a_i, b_i. At the horizon the other eigenvalues Z_i vanish (see chapter 4). The value $|Z|_{min}$ is related to the Bekenstein Hawking entropy of the solution and it is expressed in terms of the quartic invariant of the 56–representation of $E_{7(7)}$, which in principle depends on all the 8 charges of the STU model (see section 4.5.1 and in particular eq.(4.5.6)). Nevertheless there is a residual $[U(1)]^3 \in [SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ acting on the $N = 8$ central charge matrix in its normal form. These three gauge parameters can be used to reduce the number of charges appearing in the quartic invariant (entropy)from 8 to 5, as we have already pointed out. We shall see how these 3 conditions may be implemented on the 8 charges at the level of the first order BPS equations in order to obtain the 5 parameter generating solution for the most general 1/8 black–holes in $N = 8$ supergravity. This generating solution coincides with the solution generating the orbit of 1/2 BPS black–holes in the truncated $N = 2$ model describing type IIA supergravity compactified on $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_3$. Therefore, in the framework of this latter simpler model, we shall work out the STU model and construct the set of second and first order differential equations defining our solution.

5.7.1 The STU model in the $SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$ theory and solvable Lie algebras

As it was shown in [44] and already discussed in these lectures the hyperscalars do not contribute to the dynamics of our BPS black–hole, therefore, in what follows, all hyperscalars will be set to zero and we shall forget about the quaternionic factor $\mathcal{M}_{Quat}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{T_6/Z_3}$. The latter will then

be the scalar manifold of an $N = 2$ supergravity describing 9 vector multiplets coupled with the graviton multiplet. The 18 real scalars span the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{T_6/Z_3} = SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$, while the 10 electric and 10 magnetic charges associated with the 10 vector fields transform under duality in the **20** (three times antisymmetric) of $SU(3,3)$. As anticipated, in order to show how the STU scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ is embedded in $\mathcal{M}_{T_6/Z_3}$ we just have to use the SLA description. Indeed it suffices to quote the results of section 5.2.4 where the embedding of $Solv_{STU}$ into $Solv(SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$ was explicitly derived.

5.7.2 First order differential equations: the algebraic approach

Now that the STU model has been constructed out the original $SU(3,3)/SU(3) \times U(3)$ model, we may address the problem of writing down the BPS first order equations. To this end we shall use the geometrical intrinsic approach defined in [44] and eventually compare it with the Special Kähler geometry formalism.

The system of first order differential equations in the background fields is obtained from the Killing spinor equations (3.6.9),(3.6.10), with parameter as in eq.(3.6.11). In our case we have that $i = 1,2,3$ labels the three matter vector fields, while here as in any other $N = 2$ theory $A, B = 1,2$ are the $SU(2)$ R-symmetry indices.

Following the procedure defined in previous chapters and sections, in order to obtain a system of first order differential equations out of the killing spinor conditions we make the ansätze (3.1.1) for the metric, (3.6.5),(3.6.4), (3.6.3)for the field strengths and we assume radial dependence for the scalar fields. We represent the scalars of the STU model in terms of three complex fields $\{z^i\} \equiv \{S,T,U\}$, parametrizing each of the three factors $SL(2,\mathbb{R})/SO(2)$ in $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$.

In terms of special Kähler geometry the first order equations were already derived for a generic $N = 2$ theory and they are given by eq.s (3.6.12) and (3.6.13). We just have to particularize such equations to our specific STU–model.

In order to compute the explicit form of eqs.(3.6.12) and (3.6.13) in a geometrical intrinsic way [44] we need to decompose the 4 vector fields into the graviphoton $F^0_{\mu\nu}$ and the matter vector fields $F^i_{\mu\nu}$ in the same representation of the scalars z^i with respect to the isotropy group $H = [SO(2)]^3$. This decomposition is immediately performed by computing the positive weights $\vec{v}^{\Lambda}$ of the $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ on the three generators $\{\widetilde{g}_i\}$ of H combined in such a way as to factorize in H the automorphism group $H_{aut} = SO(2)$ of the supersymmetry algebra generated by $\lambda = \widetilde{g}_1 + \widetilde{g}_2 + \widetilde{g}_3$ from the remaining $H_{matter} = [SO(2)]^2 = \{\widetilde{g}_1 - \widetilde{g}_2, \widetilde{g}_1 - \widetilde{g}_3\}$ generators acting non trivially only on the matter fields. The real and imaginary components of the graviphoton central charge Z will be associated with the weight, say $\vec{v}^0$ having vanishing value on the generators of H_{matter}. The remaining weights will define a representation $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})$ of H in which the real and imaginary parts of the central charges Z^i associated with $F^i_{\mu\nu}$ transform and will be denoted by $\vec{v}^i$, $i = 1,2,3$. This representation is the same as the one in which the 6 real scalar components of $z^i = a_i + \mathrm{i}b_i$ transform with respect to H. It is useful to define on the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ curved indices α and rigid indices $\widehat{\alpha}$, both running form 1 to 6. Using the solvable parametrization of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$, which defines real coordinates ϕ^{α}, the generators of $Solv_{STU} = \{T^{\alpha}\}$ carry curved indices since they are parametrized by the coordinates, but do not transform in a representation of the isotropy group. The compact generators $\mathbb{K} = Solv_{STU} + Solv^{\dagger}_{STU}$ of $[SL(2,\mathbb{R})]^3$ on the other hand transform in the $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2})$ of H and we

can choose an orthonormal basis (with respect to the trace) for $\mathbb{K}$ consisting of the generators $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{\alpha}} = T^{\alpha} + T^{\alpha\dagger}$. These generators now carry the rigid index and are in one to one correspondence with the real scalar fields ϕ^{α}. There is a one to one correspondence between the non–compact matrices $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{\alpha}}$ and the eigenvectors $|v^{i}_{x,y}\rangle$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ which are orthonormal bases (in different spaces) of the same representation of H:

$$\underbrace{\{\mathbb{K}^1, \mathbb{K}^2, \mathbb{K}^3, \mathbb{K}^4, \mathbb{K}^5, \mathbb{K}^6\}}_{\{\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{\alpha}}\}} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \underbrace{\{|v^1_x\rangle, |v^2_y\rangle, |v^3_y\rangle, |v^1_y\rangle, |v^2_x\rangle, |v^3_x\rangle\}}_{\{|v^{\widehat{\alpha}}\rangle\}} \tag{5.7.3}$$

The relation between the real parameters ϕ^{α} of the SLA and the real and imaginary parts of the complex fields z^i is:

$$\{\phi^{\alpha}\} \quad \equiv \quad \{-2a_1, -2a_2, -2a_3, \log(-b_1), \log(-b_2), \log(-b_3),\} \tag{5.7.4}$$

Using the $Sp(8)_D$ representation of $Solv_{STU}$, we construct the coset representative $\mathbb{L}(\phi^{\alpha})$ of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ and the vielbein $\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{\alpha}}_{\alpha}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{L}(a_i, b_i) \quad &= \quad \exp(T_{\alpha}\phi^{\alpha}) = \\
&\quad (1 - 2a_1 g_1) \cdot (1 - 2a_2 g_2) \cdot (1 - 2a_3 g_3) \cdot \exp\left(\sum_i \log(-b_i) h_i\right) \\
\mathbb{P}^{\widehat{\alpha}} \quad &= \quad \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{\alpha}} \mathbb{L}^{-1} d\mathbb{L}\right) = \{-\frac{da_1}{2b_1}, -\frac{da_2}{2b_2}, -\frac{da_3}{2b_3}, \frac{db_1}{2b_1}, \frac{db_2}{2b_2}, \frac{db_3}{2b_3}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.5}$$

The scalar kinetic term of the lagrangian is $\sum_{\widehat{\alpha}} (\mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\alpha}})^2$. The following relations between quantities computed in the solvable approach and Special Kähler formalism hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathbb{P}^{\alpha}_{\widehat{\alpha}} \langle v^{\widehat{\alpha}} | \mathbb{L}^t \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M}\right) \quad &= \quad \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Re}(g^{ij^\star}(\overline{h}_{j^\star|\Lambda})), -\mathrm{Re}(g^{ij^\star}(\overline{f}^{\Sigma}_{j^\star})) \\ \mathrm{Im}(g^{ij^\star}(\overline{h}_{j^\star|\Lambda})), -\mathrm{Im}(g^{ij^\star}(\overline{f}^{\Sigma}_{j^\star})) \end{pmatrix} \\
\begin{pmatrix} \langle v^0_y | \mathbb{L}^t \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M} \\ \langle v^0_x | \mathbb{L}^t \mathbb{C}\mathbb{M} \end{pmatrix} \quad &= \quad \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Re}(M_{\Lambda}), -\mathrm{Re}(L^{\Sigma}) \\ \mathrm{Im}(M_{\Lambda}), -\mathrm{Im}(L^{\Sigma}) \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.6}$$

where in the first equation both sides are 6×8 matrix in which the rows are labelled by α. The first three values of α correspond to the axions a_i, the last three to the dilatons $\log(-b_i)$. The columns are to be contracted with the vector consisting of the 8 electric and magnetic charges $|\vec{Q}\rangle_{sc} = 2\pi(p^{\Lambda}, q_{\Sigma})$ in the *special coordinate* symplectic gauge of $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$. In eqs. (5.7.6) $\mathbb{C}$ is the symplectic invariant matrix, while $\mathbf{M}$ is the symplectic matrix relating the charge vectors in the $Sp(8)_D$ representation and in the *special coordinate* symplectic gauge:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\vec{Q}\rangle_{Sp(8)_D} \quad &= \quad \mathbf{M} \cdot |\vec{Q}\rangle_{sc} \\
\mathbf{M} \quad &= \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in Sp(8, \mathbb{R})
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.7}$$

Using eqs. (5.7.6) it is now possible to write in a geometrically intrinsic way the first order equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\phi^\alpha}{dr} &= \left(\mp\frac{e^U}{r^2}\right)\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}\mathbb{P}^\alpha_{\widehat{\alpha}}\langle v^{\widehat{\alpha}}|\mathbb{L}^t\mathbb{C}\mathbf{M}|\vec{Q}\rangle_{sc} \\
\frac{dU}{dr} &= \left(\mp\frac{e^U}{r^2}\right)\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi}\langle v^0_y|\mathbb{L}^t\mathbb{C}\mathbf{M}|\vec{Q}\rangle_{sc} \\
0 &= \langle v^0_x|\mathbb{L}^t\mathbb{C}\mathbf{M}|t\rangle_{sc}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.8}$$

The full explicit form of eq.s (5.7.8) can be found in Appendix A where, using eq. (3.6.17), everything is expressed in terms of the quantized moduli-independent charges (q_Λ, p^Σ). The fixed values of the scalars at the horizon are obtained by setting the right hand side of the above equations to zero and the result is consistent with the literature ([48]):

$$\begin{aligned}
(a_1+\mathrm{i}b_1)_{fix} &= \frac{p^\Lambda q_\Lambda - 2p^1q_1 - \mathrm{i}\sqrt{f(p,q)}}{2p^2p^3 - 2p^0q_1} \\
(a_2+\mathrm{i}b_2)_{fix} &= \frac{p^\Lambda q_\Lambda - 2p^2q_2 - \mathrm{i}\sqrt{f(p,q)}}{2p^1p^3 - 2p^0q_2} \\
(a_3+\mathrm{i}b_3)_{fix} &= \frac{p^\Lambda q_\Lambda - 2p^3q_3 - \mathrm{i}\sqrt{f(p,q)}}{2p^1p^2 - 2p^0q_3}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.9}$$

where $f(p,q)$ is the $E_{7(7)}$ quartic invariant $S^2(p,q)$ (see eq.s (4.5.6) and (4.5.14)) expressed as a function of all the 8 charges (and whose square root is the entropy of the solution):

$$S^2(p,q) \,=\, f(p,q) \,=\, -(p^0q_0 - p^1q_1 + p^2q_2 + p^3q_3)^2 + 4(p^2p^3 - p^0q_1)(p^1q_0 + q_2q_3) \tag{5.7.10}$$

The last of eqs. (5.7.8) expresses the reality condition for $Z(\phi,p,q)$ and it amounts to fix one of the three $SO(2)$ gauge symmetries of H giving therefore a condition on the 8 charges. Without spoiling the generality (up to U–duality) of the black–hole solution it is still possible to fix the remaining $[SO(2)]^2$ gauges in H by imposing two conditions on the phases of the $Z^i(\phi,p,q)$. For instance we could require two of the $Z^i(\phi,p,q)$ to be imaginary. This would imply two more conditions on the charges, leading to a generating solution depending only on 5 parameters as we expect it to be [52]. Hence we can conclude with the following:

Statement 5.7.1 *Since the radial evolution of the axion fields a_i is related to the real part of the corresponding central charge $Z^i(\phi,p,q)$ (see (3.6.12)), up to U duality transformations, the* **5 parameter generating solution** *will have* **3 dilatons** *and* **1 axion** *evolving from their fixed value at the horizon to the boundary value at infinity, and 2 constant axions whose value is the corresponding fixed one at the horizon (double fixed).*

5.7.3 The first order equations: the special geometry approach

The first order BPS equations may be equivalently formulated within a Special Kähler description of the manifold $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$. In the *special coordinate* symplectic gauge, all the geometrical

quantities defined on $\mathcal{M}_{STU}$ may be deduced form a cubic *prepotential* $F(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{z^i\} = \{S,T,U\} \quad , \quad \Omega(z) &= \begin{pmatrix} X^\Lambda(z) \\ F_\Sigma(z) \end{pmatrix} \\
X^\Lambda(z) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ S \\ T \\ U \end{pmatrix} \\
F_\Sigma(z) &= \partial_\Sigma F(X) \\
\mathcal{K}(z,\overline{z}) &= -\log(8|\mathrm{Im}S\mathrm{Im}T\mathrm{Im}U|) \\
g_{ij^\star}(z,\overline{z}) = \partial_i\partial_{j^\star}\mathcal{K}(z,\overline{z}) &= \mathrm{diag}\{-\left(\overline{S}-S\right)^{-2}, -\left(\overline{T}-T\right)^{-2}, -\left(\overline{U}-U\right)^{-2}\} \\
\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \overline{F}_{\Lambda\Sigma} + 2\mathrm{i}\frac{\mathrm{Im}F_{\Lambda\Omega}\mathrm{Im}F_{\Sigma\Pi}L^\Omega L^\Pi}{L^\Omega L^\Pi \mathrm{Im}F_{\Omega\Pi}} \\
F_{\Lambda\Sigma}(z) &= \partial_\Lambda\partial_\Sigma F(X) \\
F(X) &= \frac{X^1X^2X^3}{X^0}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.11}$$

The covariantly holomorphic symplectic section $V(z,\overline{z})$ and its covariant derivative $U_i(z,\overline{z})$ are:

$$\begin{aligned}
V(z,\overline{z}) &= \begin{pmatrix} L^\Lambda(z,\overline{z}) \\ M_\Sigma(z,\overline{z}) \end{pmatrix} = e^{\mathcal{K}(z,\overline{z})/2}\Omega(z,\overline{z}) \\
U_i(z,\overline{z}) &= \begin{pmatrix} f_i^\Lambda(z,\overline{z}) \\ h_{i|\Sigma}(z,\overline{z}) \end{pmatrix} = \nabla_i V(z,\overline{z}) = (\partial_i + \frac{\partial_i\mathcal{K}}{2})V(z,\overline{z}) \\
\overline{U}_{i^\star}(z,\overline{z}) &= \begin{pmatrix} \overline{f}_{i^\star}^\Lambda(z,\overline{z}) \\ \overline{h}_{i^\star|\Sigma}(z,\overline{z}) \end{pmatrix} = \nabla_{i^\star}\overline{V}(z,\overline{z}) = (\partial_{i^\star} + \frac{\partial_{i^\star}\mathcal{K}}{2})\overline{V}(z,\overline{z}) \\
M_\Sigma(z,\overline{z}) &= \mathcal{N}_{\Sigma\Lambda}(z,\overline{z})L^\Lambda(z,\overline{z}) \\
h_{i|\Sigma}(z,\overline{z}) &= \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{\Sigma\Lambda}(z,\overline{z})f_i^\Lambda(z,\overline{z})
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.12}$$

The real and imaginary part of $\mathcal{N}$ in terms of the real part a_i and imaginary part b_i of the complex scalars z^i are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2\,a1\,a2\,a3 & -(a2\,a3) & -(a1\,a3) & -(a1\,a2) \\ -(a2\,a3) & 0 & a3 & a2 \\ -(a1\,a3) & a3 & 0 & a1 \\ -(a1\,a2) & a2 & a1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a1^2\,b2\,b3}{b1} + \frac{b1\left(a3^2\,b2^2 + \left(a2^2+b2^2\right)b3^2\right)}{b2\,b3} & -\frac{a1\,b2\,b3}{b1} & -\frac{a2\,b1\,b3}{b2} & -\frac{a3\,b1\,b2}{b3} \\ -\frac{a1\,b2\,b3}{b1} & \frac{b2\,b3}{b1} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{a2\,b1\,b3}{b2} & 0 & \frac{b1\,b3}{b2} & 0 \\ -\frac{a3\,b1\,b2}{b3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{b1\,b2}{b3} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.13}$$

Using the above defined quantities, the first order BPS equations can be written in a complex notation as in eq. (3.6.12):

$$\frac{dS}{dr} = \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\sqrt{|\frac{\mathrm{Im}(S)}{2\mathrm{Im}(T)\mathrm{Im}(U)}|}\Big[q_0 + \overline{U}\,q_3 - \overline{U}\,p^2\,S + q_1\,S$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\overline{T}\,\left(-\left(\overline{U}\,p1\right)+q_2+\overline{U}\,p^0\,S-p^3\,S\right)\Big] \\
\frac{dT}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\sqrt{|\frac{\mathrm{Im}(T)}{2\mathrm{Im}(S)\mathrm{Im}(U)}|}\Big[q_0+\overline{U}\,q_3-\overline{U}\,p^1\,T+q_2\,T \\
& +\overline{S}\,\left(-\left(\overline{U}\,p^2\right)+q_1+\overline{U}\,p^0\,T-p^3\,T\right)\Big] \\
\frac{dU}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\sqrt{|\frac{\mathrm{Im}(U)}{2\mathrm{Im}(S)\mathrm{Im}(T)}|}\Big[q_0+\overline{t}\,q_2-\overline{T}\,p^1\,U+q_3\,U \\
& +\overline{S}\,\left(-\left(\overline{T}\,p^3\right)+q_1+\overline{T}\,p^0\,U-p^2\,U\right)\Big] \\
\frac{d\mathcal{U}}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{Im}(S)\mathrm{Im}(T)\mathrm{Im}(U)|)^{1/2}}\right)[q_0+S\,\left(T\,U\,p^0-U\,p^2-T\,p^3+q_1\right) \\
& +T\,\left(-(U\,p^1)+q_2\right)+U\,q_3] \qquad (5.7.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that to avoid confusion in the above equations the real function $U(r)$ appearing in the metric has been renamed $\mathcal{U}(r)$ so that it should not be confused with the complex scalar field U. The naming STU for the three complex scalar fields of the $SL(2,\mathbb{R})^3$ model has by now become so traditional that it could not be avoided: in the literature such an $N=2$ theory is universally referred to as the STU–model. On the other hand the name U for the scalar function in the ansatz (3.1.1) for the extremum $4D$ black–hole is also universally adopted so that the conflict of notation limited to eq.(5.7.14) could be removed only at the price of using unfamiliar notations throughout all the lectures.

The central charge $Z(z,\overline{z},p,q)$ being given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z(z,\overline{z},p,q) &= -\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{Im}(S)\mathrm{Im}(T)\mathrm{Im}(U)|)^{1/2}}\right)[q_0+S\,\left(T\,U\,p^0-U\,p^2-T\,p^3+q_1\right)+ \\
& T\,\left(-\left(U\,p^1\right)+q_2\right)+U\,q_3] \qquad (5.7.15)
\end{aligned}
$$

5.7.4 The solution: preliminaries and comments on the most general one

In order to find the solution of the STU model we need also the equations of motion that must be satisfied together with the first order ones. We go on using the Special Kähler formalism in order to let the comparison with various papers being more immediate. Let us first compute the field equations for the scalar fields z_i, which can be obtained from an $N=2$ pure supergravity action coupled to 3 vector multiplets. From the action of eq.(3.5.1) we get: Maxwell's equations :

The field equations for the vector fields and the Bianchi identities read:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_\mu\left(\sqrt{-g}\widetilde{G}^{\mu\nu}\right) &= 0 \\
\partial_\mu\left(\sqrt{-g}\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu}\right) &= 0 \qquad (5.7.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the ansatz (3.6.4) the second equation is automatically fulfilled while the first equation, as it was anticipated before, requires the quantized electric charges q_Λ defined by eq. (3.6.17)

to be r-independent (eq. (3.6.18)).

Scalar equations :

varying with respect to z^i one gets:

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_\mu\left(\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu}g_{ij^\star}\partial_\nu\overline{z}^{j^\star}\right)+\partial_i(g_{kj^\star})\partial_\mu z^k\partial_\nu\overline{z}^{j^\star}g^{\mu\nu}+$$
$$(\partial_i\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}F^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}+(\partial_i\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}\widetilde{F}^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}\;=\;0 \tag{5.7.17}$$

which, once projected onto the real and imaginary parts of both sides, read:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{e^{2\mathcal{U}}}{4b_i^2}\left(a_i''+2\frac{a_i'}{r}-2\frac{a_i'b_i'}{b_i}\right) &= -\frac{1}{2}\left((\partial_{a_i}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}F^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}+(\partial_{a_i}\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}\widetilde{F}^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}\right)\\ \frac{e^{2\mathcal{U}}}{4b_i^2}\left(b_i''+2\frac{b_i'}{r}+\frac{(a_i'^2-b_i'^2)}{b_i}\right) &= -\frac{1}{2}\left((\partial_{b_i}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}F^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}+(\partial_{b_i}\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma})F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}\widetilde{F}^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.18}$$

Einstein equations :

Varying the action (3.5.1) with respect to the metric we obtain the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}R_{MN} &= -g_{ij^\star}\partial_M z^i\partial_N\overline{z}^{j^\star}+S_{MN}\\ S_{MN} &= -2\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\left(F^\Lambda_{M\cdot}F_N^{\Sigma|\cdot}-\frac{1}{4}g_{MN}F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}F^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}\right)+\\ &\quad -2\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}\left(F^\Lambda_{M\cdot}\widetilde{F}_N^{\Sigma|\cdot}-\frac{1}{4}g_{MN}F^\Lambda_{\cdot\cdot}\widetilde{F}^{\Sigma|\cdot\cdot}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.19}$$

Projecting on the components $(M,N)=(\underline{0},\underline{0})$ and $(M,N)=(\underline{a},\underline{b})$, respectively, these equations can be written in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}''+\frac{2}{r}\mathcal{U}' &= -2e^{-2\mathcal{U}}S_{\underline{00}}\\ (\mathcal{U}')^2+\sum_i\frac{1}{4b_i^2}\left((b_i')^2+(a_i')^2\right) &= -2e^{-2\mathcal{U}}S_{\underline{00}}\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.20}$$

where:

$$S_{\underline{00}}\;=\;-\frac{2e^{4\mathcal{U}}}{(8\pi)^2r^4}\mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}_{\Lambda\Sigma}(p^\Lambda p^\Sigma+\ell(r)^\Lambda\ell(r)^\Sigma) \tag{5.7.21}$$

In order to solve these equations one would need to make explicit the right hand side expression in terms of scalar fields a_i,b_i and quantized charges (p^Λ,q_Σ). In order to do that, one has to consider the ansatz for the field strengths (3.6.4) substituting to the moduli-dependent charges $\ell_\Lambda(r)$ appearing in the previous equations their expression in terms of the quantized charges obtained by inverting eq.(3.6.17):

$$\ell^\Lambda(r) \;=\; \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N}^{-1|\Lambda\Sigma}\left(q_\Sigma-\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N}_{\Sigma\Omega}p^\Omega\right) \tag{5.7.22}$$

Using now the expression for the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ in eq. (5.7.13), one can find the explicit expression of the scalar fields equations of motion written in terms of the quantized r-independent charges.

They can be found in Appendix A. In Appendix A we report the full explicit expression of the equations of motion for both the scalars and the metric. Differently from what stated in [54], in order to find the 5 parameter generating solution of the STU model, it is not sufficient to substitute to each charge, in the scalar fixed values of eq.(5.7.9), a corresponding harmonic function ($q_i \to H_i = 1 + q_i/r$). As already explained, the generating solution should depend on 5 parameters and 4 harmonic functions, as in [53]. In particular, as explained above, 2 of the 6 scalar fields parametrizing the STU model, namely 2 axion fields, should be taken to be constant. Therefore, in order to find the generating solution one as to solve the two systems of eq.s (A.1.1) (first order) and (A.1.2) (second order) explicitly putting as an external input the information on the constant nature of 2 of the 3 axion fields. As it is evident from the above quoted system of eq.s, it is quite difficult to give a not double extreme solution of the combined system that is both explicit and manageable. It is however work in progress for a forthcoming paper [55].

5.7.5 The solution: a simplified case, namely $S = T = U$

In order to find a fully explicit solution we can deal with, let us consider the particular case where $S = T = U$. Although simpler, this solution encodes all non-trivial aspects of the most general one: it is regular, i.e. has non-zero entropy, and the scalars do evolve, i.e. it is an extreme but *not* double extreme solution. First of all let us notice that eq.s (A.1.1) remain invariant if the same set of permutations are performed on the triplet of subscripts $(1, 2, 3)$ in both the fields and the charges. Therefore the solution $S = T = U$ implies the positions $q_1 = q_2 = q_3 \equiv q$ and $p^1 = p^2 = p^3 \equiv p$ on the charges and therefore it will correspond to a solution with (apparently only) 4 independent charges (p^0, p, q_0, q). According to this identification, what we do expect now, is to find a solution which depends on (apparently) only 3 charges and 2 harmonic functions. Notice that this is not simply an axion–dilaton black–hole: such a solution would have a vanishing entropy differently from our case. The fact that we have just one complex field in our solution is because the three complex fields are taken to be equal in value. The equations (A.1.1) simplify in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{da}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{-2b}}(bq - 2\,ab\,p + \left(a^2\,b + b^3\right)\,p^0)\\
\frac{db}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{-2b}}(3\,aq - \left(3\,a^2 + b^2\right)\,p + \left(a^3 + a\,b^2\right)\,p^0 + q_0)\\
\frac{d\mathcal{U}}{dr} &= \pm\left(\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}(-b)^{3/2}}\right)(3\,aq - \left(3\,a^2 - 3\,b^2\right)\,p + \left(a^3 - 3\,a\,b^2\right)\,p^0 + q_0)\\
0 &= 3\,bq - 6\,ab\,p + \left(3\,a^2\,b - b^3\right)\,p^0
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.23}$$

where $a \equiv a_i$, $b \equiv b_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$. In this case the fixed values for the scalars a, b are:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{fix} &= \frac{p\,q + p^0\,q_0}{2\,p^2 - 2\,p^0\,q}\\
b_{fix} &= -\frac{\sqrt{f(p,q,p^0,q_0)}}{2(p^2 - p^0 q)}\\
\text{where } f(p,q,p^0,q_0) &= 3\,p^2\,q^2 + 4\,p^3\,q_0 - 6\,p\,p^0\,q\,q_0 - p^0\,\left(4\,q^3 + p^0\,{q_0}^2\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7.24}$$

Computing the central charge at the fixed point $Z_{fix}(p,q,p^0,q_0) = Z(a_{fix},b_{fix},p,q,p^0,q_0)$ one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{fix}(p,q,p^0,q_0) &= |Z_{fix}|e^{\theta} \\ |Z_{fix}(p,q,p^0,q_0)| &= f(p,q,p^0,q_0)^{1/4} \\ \sin\theta &= \frac{p^0 f(p,q,p^0,q_0)^{1/2}}{2(p^2-qp^0)^{3/2}} \\ \cos\theta &= \frac{-2\,p^3+3\,p\,p^0\,q+{p^0}^2\,q_0}{2\,(p^2-p^0\,q)^{3/2}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.25}$$

The value of the U–duality group quartic invariant (whose square root is the entropy) is:

$$S^2(p,q,p^0,q_0) = |Z_{fix}(p,q,p^0,q_0)|^4 = f(p,q,p^0,q_0) \tag{5.7.26}$$

We see form eqs.(5.7.25) that in order for Z_{fix} to be real and the entropy to be non vanishing the only possibility is $p^0=0$ corresponding to $\theta=\pi$. It is in fact necessary that $\sin\theta=0$ while keeping $f\neq 0$. We are therefore left with 3 independent charges (q,p,q_0), as anticipated.

Solution of the 1^{st} order equations

Setting $p^0=0$ the fixed values of the scalars and the quartic invariant become:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{fix} &= \frac{q}{2p} \\ b_{fix} &= -\frac{\sqrt{3q^2+4q_0p}}{2p} \\ I_4 &= (3q^2p^2+4q_0p^3) \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.27}$$

From the last of eq.s (5.7.23) we see that in this case the axion is double fixed, namely does not evolve, $a\equiv a_{fix}$ and the reality condition for the central charge is fulfilled for any r. Of course, also the axion equation is fulfilled and therefore we are left with two axion–invariant equations for b and $\mathcal{U}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{db}{dr} &= \pm\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}}}{r^2\sqrt{2b}}(q_0+\frac{3q^2}{4p}-b^2p) \\ \frac{d\mathcal{U}}{dr} &= \pm\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}}}{r^2(2b)^{3/2}}(q_0+\frac{3q^2}{4p}+3b^2p) \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.28}$$

which admit the following solution:

$$\begin{aligned} b(r) &= -\sqrt{\frac{(A_1+k_1/r)}{(A_2+k_2/r)}} \\ e^{\mathcal{U}} &= \left((A_2+\frac{k_2}{r})^3(A_1+k_1/r)\right)^{-1/4} \\ k_1 &= \pm\frac{\sqrt{2}(3q^2+4q_0p)}{4p} \\ k_2 &= \pm\sqrt{2}p \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.29}$$

In the limit $r \to 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} b(r) &\to -\left(\frac{k_1}{k_2}\right)^{1/2} = b_{fix} \\ e^{\mathcal{U}(r)} &\to r\,(k_1 k_2^3)^{-1/4} = r\,f^{-1/4} \end{aligned}$$

as expected, and the only undetermined constants are $A_1\,,\,A_2$. In order for the solution to be asymptotically minkowskian it is necessary that $(A_1\,A_2^3)^{-1/4} = 1$. There is then just one undetermined parameter which is fixed by the asymptotic value of the dilaton b. We choose for simplicity it to be -1, therefore $A_1 = 1\,,\,A_2 = 1$. This choice is arbitrary in the sense that the different value of b at infinity the different universe (≡black–hole solution), but with the same entropy. Summarizing, before considering the eq.s of motion, the solution is:

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a_{fix} = \frac{q}{2p} \\ b &= -\sqrt{\frac{(1+k_1/r)}{(1+k_2/r)}} \\ e^{\mathcal{U}} &= \left[(1+k_1/r)(1+k_2/r)^3\right]^{-1/4} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.30}$$

with k_1 and k_2 given in (5.7.29).

Solution of the 2^{st} order equations

In the case $S = T = U$ the structure of the $\mathcal{N}$ matrix (5.7.13) and of the field strengths reduces considerably. For the period matrices one simply obtains:

$$\mathrm{Re}\mathcal{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\,a^3 & -a^2 & -a^2 & -a^2 \\ -a^2 & 0 & a & a \\ -a^2 & a & 0 & a \\ -a^2 & a & a & 0 \end{pmatrix}\,,\ \mathrm{Im}\mathcal{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 3\,a^2\,b + b^3 & -(a\,b) & -(a\,b) & -(a\,b) \\ -(a\,b) & b & 0 & 0 \\ -(a\,b) & 0 & b & 0 \\ -(a\,b) & 0 & 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.7.31}$$

while the dependence of $\ell^\Lambda(r)$ from the quantized charges simplifies to:

$$\ell^\Lambda(r) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-3\,a^2\,p+3\,a\,q+q_0}{b^3} \\ \frac{-3\,a^3\,p+b^2\,q+3\,a^2\,q+a\left(-2\,b^2\,p+q_0\right)}{b^3} \\ \frac{-3\,a^3\,p+b^2\,q+3\,a^2\,q+a\left(-2\,b^2\,p+q_0\right)}{b^3} \\ \frac{-3\,a^3\,p+a^4\,p^0+b^2\,q+3\,a^2\,q+a\left(-2\,b^2\,p+q_0\right)}{b^3} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.7.32}$$

Inserting (5.7.32) in the expressions (3.6.4) and substituting the result in the eq.s of motion (5.7.18) one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(a'' - 2\frac{a'b'}{b} + 2\frac{a'}{r}\right) &= 0 \\ \left(b'' + 2\frac{b'}{r} + \frac{(a'^2 - b'^2)}{b}\right) &= -\frac{b^2\,e^{2\,\mathcal{U}}\,(p^2 - \frac{(-3\,a^2\,p+3\,a\,q+q_0)^2}{b^6})}{r^4} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.33}$$

The equation for a is automatically fulfilled by our solution (5.7.30). The equation for b is fulfilled as well and both sides are equal to:

$$\frac{(k_2 - k_1)\, e^{4\mathcal{U}} \left(k_1 + k_2 + \frac{2\,k_1\,k_2}{r}\right)}{2\,b\,r^4}$$

If $(k_2 - k_1) = 0$ both sides are separately equal to 0 which corresponds to the double fixed solution already found in [48]. Let us now consider the Einstein's equations. From equations (5.7.20) we obtain in our simpler case the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}'' + \frac{2}{r}\mathcal{U}' &= (\mathcal{U}')^2 + \frac{3}{4b^2}\left((b')^2 + (a')^2\right) \\ \mathcal{U}'' + \frac{2}{r}\mathcal{U}' &= -2e^{-2\mathcal{U}} S_{\underline{00}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7.34}$$

The first of eqs.(5.7.34) is indeed fulfilled by our ansatz. Both sides are equal to:

$$\frac{3\,(k_2 - k_1)^2}{16\,r^4 (H_1)^2\,(H_2)^2} \tag{5.7.35}$$

Again, both sides are separately zero in the double-extreme case $(k_2 - k_1) = 0$. The second equation is fulfilled, too, by our ansatz and again both sides are zero in the double-extreme case. Therefore we can conclude with the

Statement 5.7.2 *Eq.(5.7.30) yields a* $\frac{1}{8}$ *supersymmetry preserving solution of N=8 supergravity that is* **not double extreme** *and has a* **finite entropy***:*

$$S_{BH} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\left(3\,p^2\,q^2 + 4\,q_0 p^3\right)^{1/2} \tag{5.7.36}$$

depending on three of the 5 *truly independent charges*

On the other hand if in eq.(5.7.30) we set $k_1 = k_2$ we see that both the dilaton and the axion are set to a constant value equal to the fixed value. At the same time the form of the metric becomes that of an $a = 0$ 0–brane solution as described in eq. (3.1.14). As the critical values $a = \sqrt{3}$ and $a = 1$ are respectively associated with 1/2 and 1/4 supersymmetry preserving black–holes, in the same way the last critical value $a = 0$ is associated with 1/8 preserving black–holes. This case is the only one where scalar fields are finite at the horizon and correspondingly the entropy can be non–vanishing and finite.

Appendix A

The full set of first and second order differential equations for the STU–model

Setting $z^i = a_i + \mathrm{i}b_i$ eqs.(5.7.14) can be rewritten in the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{da_1}{dr} &= \pm\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\sqrt{-\frac{b_1}{2b_2b_3}}[-b_1q_1 + b_2q_2 + b_3q_3 + \Big(-(a_2\,a_3\,b_1) \\
&\quad +a_1\,a_3\,b_2 + a_1\,a_2\,b_3 + b_1\,b_2\,b_3\Big)\,p^0 + \\
&\quad +(-(a_3\,b_2) - a_2\,b_3)\,p^1 + (a_3\,b_1 - a_1\,b_3)\,p^2 \\
&\quad +(a_2\,b_1 - a_1\,b_2)\,p^3] \\
\frac{db_1}{dr} &= \pm\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\sqrt{-\frac{b_1}{2b_2b_3}}[a_1q_1 + a_2q_2 + a_3q_3 \\
&\quad +(a_1\,a_2\,a_3 + a_3\,b_1\,b_2 + a_2\,b_1\,b_3 - a_1\,b_2\,b_3)\,p^0 + \\
&\quad +(-(a_2\,a_3) + b_2\,b_3)\,p^1 - (a_1\,a_3 + b_1\,b_3)\,p^2 \\
&\quad -(a_1\,a_2 + b_1\,b_2)\,p^3 + q_0] \\
\frac{da_2}{dr} &= (1,2,3) \to (2,1,3) \\
\frac{db_2}{dr} &= (1,2,3) \to (2,1,3) \\
\frac{da_3}{dr} &= (1,2,3) \to (3,2,1) \\
\frac{db_3}{dr} &= (1,2,3) \to (3,2,1) \\
\frac{d\mathcal{U}}{dr} &= \pm\frac{e^{\mathcal{U}(r)}}{r^2}\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}(-b_1b_2b_3)^{1/2}}[a_1q_1 + a_2q_2 + a_3q_3 \\
&\quad +(a_1\,a_2\,a_3 - a_3\,b_1\,b_2 - a_2\,b_1\,b_3 - a_1\,b_2\,b_3)\,p^0 + \\
&\quad -(a_2\,a_3 - b_2\,b_3)\,p^1 - (a_1\,a_3 - b_1\,b_3)\,p^2 - (a_1\,a_2 - b_1\,b_2)\,p^3 + q_0] \\
0 &= b_1q_1 + b_2q_2 + b_3q_3 + (a_2\,a_3\,b_1 + a_1\,a_3\,b_2 + a_1\,a_2\,b_3 - b_1\,b_2\,b_3)\,p^0 \\
&\quad -(a_3\,b_2 + a_2\,b_3)\,p^1 \\
&\quad -(a_3\,b_1 + a_1\,b_3)\,p^2 - (a_2\,b_1 - a_1\,b_2)\,p^3
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.1.1}
$$

The explicit form of the equations of motion for the most general case is:

Scalar equations :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(a_1'' - 2\frac{a_1' b_1'}{b_1} + 2\frac{a_1'}{r}\right) &= \frac{-2\,b_1\,e^{2\mathcal{U}}}{r^4}\,[a_1\,b_2\,b_3\,(p^{1\,2} - \ell(r)_1{}^2) \\
&\quad +b_2\,(-(b_3\,p^1\,p^2) + b_3\,\ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_2) + \\
&\quad +b_1\,(-2\,a_2\,a_3\,p^1\,\ell(r)_1 + a_3\,p^3\,\ell(r)_1 + a_2\,p^4\,\ell(r)_1 + a_3\,p^1\,\ell(r)_3 + \\
&\quad -p^4\,\ell(r)_3 + a_2\,p^1\,\ell(r)_4 - p^3\,\ell(r)_4)] \\
\left(b_1'' + 2\frac{b_1'}{r} + \frac{(a_1'^2 - b_1'^2)}{b_1}\right) &= -\frac{e^{2\mathcal{U}}}{b_2\,b_3\,r^4}\,[-(a_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p^{1\,2}) + b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p^{1\,2} \\
&\quad +2\,a_1\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p^1\,p^2 + \\
&\quad -b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p^{2\,2} + b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p^{3\,2} + b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,p^{4\,2} \\
&\quad +a_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1{}^2 + \\
&\quad -b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1{}^2 + a_3{}^2\,b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,(p^{1\,2} - \ell(r)_1{}^2) \\
&\quad +a_2{}^2\,b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2 \\
&\quad (p^{1\,2} - \ell(r)_1{}^2) - 2\,a_1\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_2 + b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_2{}^2 + \\
&\quad -b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_3{}^2 + 2\,a_2\,b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,(-(p^1\,p^3) + \ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_3) + \\
&\quad -b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,\ell(r)_4{}^2 + 2\,a_3\,b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,(-(p^1\,p^4) + \ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_4)] \\
\left(a_2'' - 2\frac{a_2' b_2'}{b_2} + 2\frac{a_2'}{r}\right) &= (1,2,3) \to (2,1,3) \\
\left(b_2'' + 2\frac{b_2'}{r} + \frac{(a_2'^2 - b_2'^2)}{b_2}\right) &= (1,2,3) \to (2,1,3) \\
\left(a_3'' - 2\frac{a_3' b_3'}{b_3} + 2\frac{a_3'}{r}\right) &= (1,2,3) \to (3,2,1) \\
\left(b_3'' + 2\frac{b_3'}{r} + \frac{(a_3'^2 - b_3'^2)}{b_3}\right) &= (1,2,3) \to (3,2,1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Einstein equations :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}'' + \frac{2}{r}\mathcal{U}' &= -2e^{-2\mathcal{U}} S_{00} \\
(\mathcal{U}')^2 + \sum_i \frac{1}{4b_i^2}\left((b_i')^2 + (a_i')^2\right) &= 2e^{-2\mathcal{U}} S_{00}
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.1.2}
$$

where the quantity S_{00} on the right hand side of the Einstein eqs. has the following form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{00} &= \frac{e^{4\mathcal{U}}}{4\,b_1\,b_2\,b_3\,r^4}\,(a_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p_1{}^2 + b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p_1{}^2 - 2\,a_1\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p_1\,p_2 + b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p_2{}^2 + b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,p_3{}^2 + \\
&\quad +b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,p_4{}^2 + a_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1{}^2 + b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1{}^2 + a_3{}^2\,b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,(p_1{}^2 + \ell(r)_1{}^2) + \\
&\quad +a_2{}^2\,b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,(p_1{}^2 + \ell(r)_1{}^2) - 2\,a_1\,b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_2 + b_2{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_2{}^2 + b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,\ell(r)_3{}^2 + \\
&\quad -2\,a_2\,b_1{}^2\,b_3{}^2\,(p_1\,p_3 + \ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_3) + b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,\ell(r)_4{}^2 - 2\,a_3\,b_1{}^2\,b_2{}^2\,(p_1\,p_4 + \ell(r)_1\,\ell(r)_4))
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.1.3}
$$

The explicit expression of the $\ell_\Lambda(r)$ charges in terms of the quantized ones is computed from eq. (5.7.22):

$$\ell_\Lambda(r) \;=\; \frac{1}{b_1\, b_2\, b_3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \Big[q_1 + a_1 \, \left(a_2\, a_3\, p^1 - a_3\, p^3 - a_2\, p^4 + q_2 \right) \\ + a_2 \, \left(- \left(a_3\, p^2 \right) + q_3 \right) + a_3\, q_4 \Big] \\ \hline \Big[{a_1}^2 \, \left(a_2\, a_3\, p^1 - a_3\, p^3 - a_2\, p^4 + q_2 \right) + {b_1}^2 \, \left(a_2\, a_3\, p^1 - a_3\, p^3 - a_2\, p^4 + q_2 \right) \\ + a_1 \, \left(q_1 + a_2 \, \left(- \left(a_3\, p^2 \right) + q_3 \right) + a_3\, q_4 \right) \Big] \\ \hline \Big[a_1 \, \Big({a_2}^2 \, \left(a_3\, p^1 - p^4 \right) + {b_2}^2 \, \left(a_3\, p^1 - p^4 \right) + a_2 \, \left(- \left(a_3\, p^3 \right) + q_2 \right) \Big) \\ + {a_2}^2 \, \left(- \left(a_3\, p^2 \right) + q_3 \right) + {b_2}^2 \, \left(- \left(a_3\, p^2 \right) + q_3 \right) + a_2 \, \left(q_1 + a_3\, q_4 \right) \Big] \\ \hline \Big[a_3\, q_1 + a_1 \, \Big(- \left({a_3}^2\, p^3 \right) - {b_3}^2\, p^3 + a_2 \, \Big({a_3}^2\, p^1 + {b_3}^2\, p^1 - a_3\, p^4 \Big) + a_3\, q_2 \Big) \\ - a_2 \, \Big({a_3}^2\, p^2 + {b_3}^2\, p^2 - a_3\, q_3 \Big) + {a_3}^2\, q_4 + {b_3}^2\, q_4 \Big] \end{array} \right) \tag{A.1.4}$$

Bibliography

[1] A. Strominger, C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. **B379** (1986) 99

[2] For a recent update see: J. M. Maldacena, "*Black-Holes in String Theory*", hep-th/9607235

[3] References on susy black holes:

G. Gibbons, in "*Unified theories of Elementary Particles. Critical Assessment and Prospects*", Proceedings of the Heisemberg Symposium, München, West Germany, 1981, ed. by P. Breitenlohner and H. P. Dürr, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 160 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982); G. W. Gibbons and C. M. Hull, Phys. lett. **109B** (1982) 190; G. W. Gibbons, in "*Supersymmetry, Supergravity and Related Topics*", Proceedings of the XVth GIFT International Physics, Girona, Spain, 1984, ed. by F. del Aguila, J. de Azcárraga and L. Ibáñez, (World Scientific, 1995), pag. 147; R. Kallosh, A. Linde, T. Ortin, A. Peet and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 5278; R. Kallosh, T. Ortin and A. Peet, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 5400; R. Kallosh, Phys. Lett. **B282** (1992) 80; R. Kallosh and A. Peet, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 5223; A. Sen, Nucl. Phys. **B440** (1995) 421; Phys. Lett. **B303** (1993) 221; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10** (1995) 2081; J. Schwarz and A. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B312** (1993) 105;

[4] R. Kallosh, T. Ortin, "*Charge qiantization of Axion Dilaton black–holes*" Phys. rev. **D48** (1993) 742, hep-th 9302109,
E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, T. Ortin "*Stationary Axion Dilaton solutions and supersymmetry* Nuc. Phys. **B478** (1996) 156, hep-th 9605059.

[5] M.J. Duff, R.R. Khuri and J.X. Lu, "*String Solitons*", Phys.Rept.259:213-326,1995, hep-th/9412184

[6] For recent reviews see: J. Schwarz, preprint CALTECH-68-2065, hep-th/9607201; M. Duff, preprint CPT-TAMU-33-96, hep-th/9608117; A. Sen, preprint MRI-PHY-96-28, hep-th/9609176

[7] A. Sen and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B 312** (1993) 105 and Nucl. Phys. **B 411** (1994) 35

[8] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B 451** (1995) 525, hep-th/9505073 E. Witten, hep-th/9503124, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 85

[9] C.M. Hull and P.K. Townsend, hep-th/9410167, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109

[10] J. H. Schwarz, "*M–Theory Extension of T–Duality*", hep-th/9601077; C. Vafa, "*Evidence for F–Theory*", hep-th/9602022

[11] J. Polchinski, hep-th/9510017 Phys. Rev. Lett **75** (1995) 4724;

[12] For a recent review see: J. Polchinski, "*TASI Lectures on D-Branes*" and J. Polchinski, S. Chaudhuri and C. Johnson, "*Notes on D-Branes*", hep-th/9602052

[13] H.Lu, C.N. Pope, E. Sezgin and K.S. Stelle, hep th 9508042, H. Lu, C.N. Pope, hep th 9605082, M. J. Duff, H. Lu and C.N. Pope, hep th 9604052, H.Lu, C.N. Pope and K.S. Stelle hep the 9602140.

[14] The literature on this topic is quite extended. As a general review, see the lecture notes:

K. Stelle, "Lectures on Supergravity p–Branes", Lectures presented at 1996 ICTP Summer School, Trieste, hep-th/9701088

[15] For a recent comprehensive updating on M–brane solutions see also

P. K. Townsend, "M–Theory from its Superalgebra", Talk given at the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Strings, Branes and Dualities, Cargese, France, 26 May - 14 June 1997, hep-th/9712004

[16] For a review on supergravity and superstring theory the reader can see the book by L. Castellani, R. D?auria, P. Fré, **Supergravity and Superstring Theory:***a geometric perspective*, World Scientific 1990.

[17] L.Castellani, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré and M. Trigiante, hep-th/9803039.

[18] P.G.O. Freund and M.A. Rubin, "Dynamics of Dimensional Reduction", *Phys. Lett* **97B** (1980) 233

[19] L. Castellani, L. J. Romans and N. P. Warner, "A Classification of Compactifying Solutions of D=11 Supergravity", *Nucl. Phys.* **B241** (1984) 429

[20] M.J.Duff, H. Lü, C.N. Pope and E. Sezgin, "Supermembranes with fewer supersymmetries", Phys. Lett. **B371** (1996) 206, hep-th/9511162.

[21] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B212 (1983) 413

[22] P. Fré and P. Soriani, The N=2 Wonderland: from Calabi–Yau manifolds to topological field theories, WORLD SCIENTIFIC, Singapore 1995.

[23] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, "The Symplectic Structure of N=2 Supergravity and its Central Extension", Nucl. Phys. B46 (Proc. Suppl.) (1996) 67, hep-th/9509160.

[24] E. Cremmer and A. Van Proeyen Class. Quantum Grav. 2 (1985) 445.

[25] M.K: Gaillard, B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B193 (1981) 221

[26] P. Fré Lectures given at the Trieste 1995 Spring school, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **45B,C** (1996) 59-114

[27] L. Andrianopoli, M. Bertolini, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré, T. Magri, Journal of Geometry and Physics **23** (1997) 111.

[28] S. Ferrara, A. Van Proeyen Class. Quantum Grav. 2 (1989) 124.

[29] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and M. Porrati, "Minimal Higgs Branch for the Breaking of Half of the Supersymmetry in N=2 Supergravity", preprint CERN-TH/95-268, hep-th/9510074.

[30] B. Bertotti, Phys. rev. **116** (1959) 1331, I. Robinson, Bull. Acad. Pol. **7** (1959) 351

[31] E. Calabi and E. Visentini, Ann. of Math. 71 (1960) 472.

[32] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B444 (1995) 92, hep-th/9502072; "On Electromagnetic Duality in Locally Supersymmetric N=2 Yang-Mills Theory", hep-th/9412200, Proceedings of the Workshop on Physics from the Planck Scale to Electromagnetic Scale, Warsaw 1994.

[33] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh, A. Strominger, hep-th/ 9508072

[34] A. Strominger hep-th/9602111

[35] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh, hep-th/9602136

[36] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara. P. Fré and E. Maina, Nucl. Phys. **B 286** (1986) 317

[37] E. Bergshoeff, I. G. Koh and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **155 B** (1985) 71; M. de Roo and F. Wagemans, Nucl. Phys. **B 262** (1985) 644

[38] A. Salam and E. Sezgin, *Supergravities in diverse Dimensions* Edited by A. Salam and E. Sezgin, North–Holland, World Scientific 1989, vol. 1

[39] E. Cremmer, in "Supergravity '81", ed. by S. Ferrara and J.G. Taylor, pag. 313; B. Julia in "Superspace & Supergravity" (editor S.W. Hawking and M. Rocek) , Cambridge (1981) pag.331

[40] See for example: S. Helgason, " Differential Geometry and Symmetric Spaces", New York: Academic Press (1962); R. Gilmore, "Lie groups, Lie algebras and some of their applications", (1974) ed. J. Wiley and sons

[41] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré, and M. Trigiante *Nucl. Phys.* **B496** (1997) 617 (hep-th/9611014).

[42] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré, R. Minasian, M. Trigiante *Nucl. Phys.* **B493** (1997) 249 (hep-th/9612202).

[43] D.V. Alekseevskii, Math. USSR Izvestija, **Vol. 9** (1975), No.2

[44] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Frè and M. Trigiante, Nucl.Phys. **B509** (1998) 463 (hep-th/9707087).

[45] G. Arcioni, A. Ceresole, F. Cordaro, R. D'Auria, P. Frè, L. Gualtieri and M. Trigiante, *"N=8 BPS Black Holes with 1/2 or 1/4 Supersymmetry and Solvable Lie Algebra Decompositions"*, hep-th/9807136.

[46] M. Bertolini, P. Fré, M. Trigiante, hep-th 9811251

[47] S. Ferrara, M. Gunaydin, Int.J.Mod.Phys. A13 (1998) 2075, hep-th/9708025

[48] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu, J. Rahmfeld, "*Four Dimensional String/String/String Triality* ", Nucl.Phys. B459 (1996) 125, hep-th/9508094; R. Kallosh, M. Shmakova, W. K. Wong, "*Freezing of Moduli by N=2 Dyons*", Phys.Rev. D54 (1996) 6284, hep-th/9607077; K. Behrndt, R. Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld, M. Smachova and W. K. Wond, "*STU Black-holes and string triality*", hep-th/9608059; G. Lopes Cardoso, D. Lust and T. Mohaupt, "*Modular Symmetries of N=2 Black Holes* ", Phys.Lett. B388 (1996) 266, hep-th/9608099; K. Behrndt, D. Lust, W. A. Sabra, "*Stationary solutions of N=2 supergravity*", hep-th/9705169

[49] S. Ferrara, J. Maldacena "*Branes, Central Charges and U–Duality invariant BPS conditions*" hep-th 9706097 Class. Quant. Grav. **15** (1998) 749.

[50] S. Ferrara, M. Gunaydin and C.A. Savoy, unpublished.

[51] M. Cvetic and C. M. Hull, "*Black Holes and U-Duality* ", Nucl.Phys. B480 (1996) 296, hep-th/9606193

[52] V. Balasubramanian, *"How to count the states of extremal black holes in $N = 8$ Supergravity"*, hep-th/9712215.

[53] M. Cvetic, D. Youm, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 584 (hep-th/9507090); Nucl. Phys. **B472** (1996) 249 (hep-th/9512127); Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 2612 (hep-th/9603147); M. Cvetic, A. Tseytlin, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 5619; Erratum-ibid. **D55** (1997) 3907 (hep-th/9512031).

[54] K. Behrndt, D. Lust, W. A. Sabra, Nucl. Phys. **B510** (1998) 264 (hep-th/9705169); K. Behrndt, M. Cvetic, W. A. Sabra, Phys.Rev. **D58** (1998) 084018 (hep-th/9712221).

[55] M. Bertolini, P. Frè, M. Trigiante, work in progress.